

# THE MONTH

*A Catholic Magazine and Review.*

JUNE, 1895.

## CONTENTS.

1. THE ART OF THE YEAR. <i>By the Editor.</i>	153
2. EDUCATION IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC. Part II. <i>By Francis W. Grey.</i>	165
3. THE DUCHESS BONA'S INDULGENCE. <i>By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith.</i>	174
4. THE RELIGIOUS TEST ACTS. Part II. <i>By the Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.S.S.R.</i>	190
5. NEWFOUNDLAND'S TREATY OBLIGATIONS TO FRANCE. <i>By A. R. Whiteway.</i>	204
6. MARRIAGE AFTER DIVORCE. <i>By William C. Maude.</i>	213
7. SPURIOUS RECORDS OF TUDOR MARTYRS. <i>By the Rev. J. H. Pollen.</i>	217
8. AN OLD PICTURE. <i>By the Rev. Charles Coupe.</i>	229
9. AN APOLOGIST OF A MARRIED CLERGY. <i>By the Rev. Herbert Thurston.</i>	245
10. THE JESUITS IN CANADA. <i>By S. C. Richards.</i>	261
REVIEWS	281
1. Some Side-Lights on the Oxford Movement. 2. Dr. Ludwig Pastor's History of the Popes. 3. The History of the Church in England, 1509-1603. By Mary H. Allies. 4. Elements of Religious Life. By the Rev. W. Humphrey, S.J. 5. St. Paul's Epistle to Titus. By John Bulmer, B.D., Mus. Bac. 6. The World's own Book; or, The Treasury of a Kempis. By Percy Fitzgerald. 7. Voices of the Past. A Sacred Drama. 8. An English Manor House in the Days of Queen Elizabeth; or, The Story of Edmund Campion, S.J. By J. R. Willington, M.A. 9. Panta Rye: A Prelude.	
LITERARY RECORD	298
I.—Books and Pamphlets.	
II.—Magazines.	

LONDON :

OFFICE OF THE MONTH: MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON.

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES. DUBLIN: M. H. GILL AND SON.

BALTIMORE: JOHN MURPHY AND CO.

Price Two Shillings.

*All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.*

**THE GREAT  
BLOOD  
PURIFIER  
AND  
RESTORER.**

**"FOR THE BLOOD IS THE LIFE"**

**CLARKE'S  
WORLD-FAMED  
BLOOD MIXTURE**

**LARGEST SALE  
OF ANY  
MEDICINE  
IN  
THE WORLD.**

The Great Blood Purifier and Restorer. For Cleansing and Clearing the Blood from all impurities, it cannot be too highly recommended.

For Scrofula, Scurvy, Eczema, Skin and Blood Diseases, Pimples and Sores of all kinds, it is a never-failing and permanent cure.

It Cures Old Sores.  
Cures Sores on the Neck.  
Cures Sore Legs.  
Cures Pimples on the Face.  
Cures Scurvy.  
Cures Eczema.

It Cures Ulcers.  
Cures Blood and Skin Diseases.  
Cures Glandular Swellings.  
Clears the Blood from all impure matter,  
From whatever cause arising.

It is the only real specific for Gout and Rheumatic Pains. It removes the cause from the blood and bones.

As this mixture is pleasant to the taste, and warranted free from anything injurious to the most delicate constitution of either sex, from infancy to old age, the Proprietors solicit sufferers to give it a trial to test its value.

**Important Advice to all.**—Cleanse the vitiated blood whenever you find its impurities bursting through the skin in pimples, eruptions, and sores; cleanse it when you find it obstructed and sluggish in the veins; cleanse it when it is foul—your feelings will tell you when. Keep your blood pure, and the health of the system will follow.

Sold in Bottles 2s. 9d. each, and in cases containing Six times the quantity, 11s., sufficient to effect a permanent cure in the great majority of long-standing cases. BY ALL CHEMISTS AND PATENT MEDICINE VENDORS throughout the world, or sent to any address on receipt of 33 or 132 stamps by the Proprietors, THE LINCOLN & MIDLAND COUNTIES' DRUG COMPANY, LINCOLN.

**TRADE MARK, "BLOOD MIXTURE."**

Ask for CLARKE'S World-Famed BLOOD MIXTURE, and do not be persuaded to take an imitation.

**THE UNIVERSAL HOUSEHOLD REMEDIES!!!**

**HOLLOWAY'S PILLS & OINTMENT**

These excellent FAMILY MEDICINES are invaluable in the treatment of all ailments incidental to every HOUSEHOLD. The PILLS PURIFY, REGULATE, and STRENGTHEN the whole system, while the OINTMENT is unequalled for the cure of Bad Legs, Bad Breasts, Old Wounds, Sores and Ulcers. Possessed of these REMEDIES, every Mother has at once the means of curing most complaints to which herself or Family is liable.

*N.B.*—Advice Gratis at 78, New Oxford Street, late 533, Oxford Street, London, daily between the hours of 11 and 4, or by letter.

**Works by Father Humphrey, S.J.**

The One Mediator. New Edition, revised and enlarged. 5s.

The Sacred Scriptures, or the Written Word of God. 5s.

The Vicar of Christ. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

Christian Marriage. Cheap Edition. Cloth, 1s.; sewed, 6d.

The Bible and Belief. Cheap Edition, 1s.; sewed, 6d.

Dishonest Controversy. 3d.

The Divine Teacher. A Letter to a Friend. With a Preface in reply to No. 3 of the English Church Defence Tracts, entitled *Papal Infallibility*. Sixth Edition. Cloth, 2s. 6d. Cheap edition, wrapper, 1s.

Mary Magnifying God. May Sermons. Seventh Edition. 2s. 6d.

Other Gospels; or, Lectures on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. Crown 8vo, cloth, 4s.

Mr. Fitz James Stephen and Cardinal Bellarmine. 1s.

The Religious State. A Digest of the Doctrine of Suarez, contained in his Treatise, *De Statu Religionis*. Three vols. 8vo, 1,200 pp. £1 10s.

Elements of Religious Life. 5s.







## *The Art of the Year.*

---

THOUGH the doctrine of Art for Art's sake is continually and vehemently impressed upon us, and we are bidden to estimate the value of pictures according to their own qualities alone, prescinding altogether from that which they represent, there can be no doubt that the general public, in its secret heart at least, if it have not the courage to declare its convictions, ignoring artistic canons, cares more for the subject than for anything else, and finds most pleasure in work which best portrays something about which it cares. Neither does there seem to be any prospect of a radical change of taste in this respect, though undoubtedly there will be found an ever-increasing number of persons content to echo what they conceive to be the proper sentiments to be entertained, and to express opinions which so far as they are concerned are altogether artificial. What we are told to regard as the Philistine view of art is not only wide-spread, but unquestionably the most ancient, and since the days when the shield of Hercules or Achilles was described by Hesiod or Homer, it has been the instinctive habit of men to think that an artist showed himself truly great only when, possessing great powers of expression, he employed them in depicting something worthy to be depicted, in producing something which made the world richer for its production. Indeed, when we consider how vast is the power of the painter for the education of his less gifted fellows, how many an ideal he has created, how many an historical character he has effected in the judgment of posterity, it seems but just to demand that he should use it with a due sense of responsibility, and devote himself, in one branch of his art or another, to that which shall not only please those who study his work, but teach them in what they should find pleasure.

Judged by such a standard it is impossible to say that our annual exhibitions, as a rule, take a high place on the roll

of art. We may leave out of consideration altogether those pictures, sure to be found in greater or less number, which very many spectators must find positively objectionable, wherein the fleshliest efforts of Paganism are imitated, while the refining influence of art which can rob them of their grossness is conspicuous only by its absence. As it is, we are expected to be elevated or instructed by looking at the bald presentment of that which, if exhibited in reality, would by universal consent call for the interference of the police.

Neither need we do more than allude to the far greater number of pictures in which mere triviality or mock sentiment is glorified. Of these there is, as usual, an abundance. The adventures of kittens and puppy dogs are told on many canvases and with every variety of detail; incidents of home life, which are not only homely, but absolutely commonplace, are handled over and over again in the most prosaic style; and we are treated to delineation in paint of objects the most unheroic and unelevating. Of what possible benefit can it be to paint a picture, however exact, of the inside of an omnibus, or of the bank of the Serpentine at the bathing hour, or of the counter of a milliner's shop? Yet we are gravely presented with the likeness of each.

Turning to what is more sober and serious, and first in the Royal Academy, we find, as is to be expected after the experience of recent years, that the most notable achievements are in portraiture, and that most of the leading names, whether of Academicians or others, are represented by one or more specimens of this. That the likenesses they give us are good, as likenesses, it is impossible to doubt, but in looking round the long list of subjects, we cannot but think of Clive Newcome's opinion concerning the value of the performance which succeeds in drawing "Mr. Muggins's head rather like Mr. Muggins." The worth of a portrait is much diminished if it be not of a person about whom we care to know; unless, indeed, the artist can, like Rembrandt or Van Dyck, invest the features of an unknown individual with a charm which makes it quite immaterial to us who he was. In spite of much undoubted cleverness, and of problems of colour and composition which they set themselves to solve, it can hardly be said that our contemporaries reach this high level, while of the subjects whom it has been their lot to reproduce, the great majority, however

interesting in domestic circles, do not appeal, for their own sake, to the outside world.

There are of course notable exceptions. Mr. Herkomer's portraits of Mr. Cecil Rhodes (188) and Dr. Jameson (51), bearing as they do the stamp of excellent likenesses, are at once raised above the common level, as being monuments of men who have made for themselves so conspicuous a place in our Imperial history. Mr. Oules' "Duke of Cambridge" (200), Mr. Lehmann's "Sir Andrew Clark" (511), the Hon. John Collier's "Lady Hallé" (495), Mr. Watts' "Professor Max Müller" (343), and Mr. Sargent's "Coventry Patmore, Esq." (172), claim distinction on similar grounds, the last-named being, moreover, a good example of the artist's characteristic style. Of Mr. Herkomer's huge "Bürgermeister and Town Council of Landsberg, Bavaria," the best and the worst that can be said is that it is as realistic as a panorama, and indeed produces much the same kind of illusion as we look for in such an exhibition.

When we turn from portraits to pictures properly so called, the first thing that must strike us is the want of an adequate theme which oppresses the efforts of the modern painter. Scriptural and ecclesiastical subjects are so foreign to the tone and temper of our age as to be well-nigh ignored, and it would probably be as well if they were neglected altogether. On the other hand, when in default of these the myths of paganism are laid under requisition, not only, as we have already said, are we apt to be treated to their worst features only, but inevitably a sense of unreality and insincerity is produced, which goes far to mar enjoyment. Of sacred pictures there are a few, but none which can in any way impress the mind or the imagination. Sir John Millais' "St. Stephen" (18), despite the aureole round the head of the dead protomartyr, is utterly void of elevation or spirituality, and nowise suggests one who had seen the heavens opened. Far worse is Mr. Watts' "Jonah" (147), which whatever merit it may have as a *tour de force* in the way of colour and drawing, is neither more nor less than an outrageous caricature, representing the Prophet as a wild crazy dervish with no sort of inspiration save that of insanity. Yet more objectionable, if we understand it aright, is Mr. Savage Cooper's triptych (559, 600, 601). On the centre panel is the head of the "Ecce Homo," with the legend "He was despised and rejected of men." On either side this idea is analyzed: on the left we

have "Despised," a rich boy looking superciliously at a poor one; on the right, "Rejected," a noble Roman looking at his ring-finger, as if to suggest that he has been unsuccessful in his wooing. Neither are we much interested or elevated by Mr. Waterhouse's "St. Cecilia" (97). The Saint is asleep in a clear walled city on the sea, with an open missal before her, while two angels are playing on a violin and a mandoline. A small organ is also introduced, and a fountain in the midst of poppies. Such a subject demands a wealth of treatment, akin to that which inspired the Ode on St. Cecilia's day, but of this there is no trace. The colouring is subdued even to sombreness, while the figures are mundane and prosaic, and suggest nothing spiritual.

Among ecclesiastical subjects we notice Mr. John F. Bacon's "Suscipe me, Domine!" (556), as perpetuating the idea that devotion is nothing if not melodramatic. A young lady, about to be clothed with the religious habit, is standing erect in front of the Bishop and attendant clergy, and with outstretched arms, is apparently, forgetful of apostolic injunctions, making a speech. Mr. Burgess, in "Students reading prohibited books" (13), likewise sets himself to perpetuate a tradition. Four or five young men in clerical dress, in a corner of a library, are with furtive and timid enjoyment regaling themselves over forbidden literature, while unseen by them a stern-looking and inquisitorial old gentleman, his costume wonderfully varied with a sky-blue cap and cape, is approaching their illicit conclave.

Among those who devote themselves to mythological or classical subjects, the most conspicuous is of course the President of the Royal Academy. His contributions are, we need not say, as faultless in drawing, and as harmonious in colouring, as usual, but they are the precise reproductions of what, season after season, we have seen from the same hand, and as utterly devoid of inspiration or human interest. At such objects Sir Frederick Leighton probably does not think of aiming, but it must be confessed, that for the average uninstructed man there is something oppressive in this constant reiteration of soulless problems of draughtsmanship and schemes of colour. In "Flaming June" (195), the artist has set himself a task of extreme technical difficulty, to draw a female figure tying itself up in a kind of knot, and to carry off the blazing costume in which she is habited, by contrast with a background of amber, crimson, and deep blue. No doubt he has done what he

proposed, but was it really worth doing? As usual, when we find Sir Frederick relaxing from such supreme efforts and condescending to what is simple and natural, we regret the more that he should devote such powers to objects which inspire us with so little interest. His small picture, "Listener" (654), for instance, a little child sitting cross-legged on a fur rug, is charming in its simplicity.

Of other specimens of classicism there is not much to say. Mr. Briton Riviere's "Phoebus Apollo," (160), the one specimen of this artist, is as different as can be from the President's style. The god—singularly ungodlike—is driving a very recalcitrant team of lions and lionesses through a mead presumably of asphodels, the flowers, though drawn in considerable detail, being hard to identify, and resembling more than anything else a cross between crocuses and buttercups. More attention is likely to be attracted by Mr. Alma Tadema's "Spring" (262), which has been pronounced on royal authority to be his masterpiece. Certainly it is a splendid example of his skill in those particulars in which he is unapproachable, with a bewildering mass of details, marble columns, porticoes, and pavements, garlands and baskets of flowers, banners and censers, and a throng of figures marching in tumultuous procession beneath, or scattering blossoms from on high. The net result of the whole is, however, not unlike that of the verse which the artist has selected from Mr. Swinburne's "Dedication" to attach to the picture, where the beauty is all in the words, which, melodious though they be, express no adequate meaning. Mr. Alma Tadema's work is capable of giving us far greater pleasure when we scrutinize its parts separately than when we endeavour to subordinate them to the whole.

Of the various Daphnes, Psyches, Junos, and Ariadnes exhibited we will say nothing, for in none of them is any quality discernible which can justify their production. Most extraordinary is Mr. Rupert C. Bunny's "The Fore-runners" (194), wherein the outriders of Neptune appear mounted on white horses—which from their character appear to be taken from the service of the omnibus company, and, from their mode of flotation, to be made of cork—whereon they drift about the surface of a sea of indigo.

Turning to the more promising field of history, we find in the first place fresh evidence of the need of some figure of heroic mould in which art may seek inspiration. Unworthy

hero though he was, the great Napoleon was undoubtedly the one figure of our century sufficiently great for such a purpose, and accordingly not a year passes without some tribute to the fascination of his personality upon the walls of the Academy. In the present exhibition we have two. Mr. Gow's "On the Sands at Boulogne, 1805" (242), represents an incident sufficiently striking and dramatic. The new-made Emperor, with his staff, is cantering along the margin of the sea, his eye strained towards the hateful island, which he hopes speedily to overwhelm, while on the horizon appear the ominous outlines of some of those weather-beaten ships which were destined to stand for ever between him and his dream of universal dominion. The other, which will be more noticed, Mr. Croft's "Napoleon's last grand attack: Waterloo" (499), depicts the supreme moment when the great captain, hoping to retrieve his desperate fortunes by one great effort, and displaying himself prominently to fire their enthusiasm, hurled his troops once more upon the impenetrable foe.

The same great battle is commemorated in another painting of singular power, Lady Butler's "Dawn at Waterloo" (853). Here the *reveillé* is sounded by two mounted buglers in the bivouac of the Scots Greys at early morn, and the officers and troopers rise wearily from their cold and cheerless slumber among the sodden corn, while the whole scene is dominated by the feeling that for many of them the next sleep will be that which knows no waking. Not far away is another large canvas, dealing with a subject sufficiently heroic, Mr. Caton Woodville's "Charge of the Light Brigade" (869). In this, however, we can see little more than a number of horsemen at a gallop; there is nothing of sentiment superadded, nor is the rush of cavalry made sensible to us.

Mr. Seymour Lucas' "Waiting for the Duke of Guise" (77) is at least historically effective. Behind a curtain embroidered with the royal insignia of Henry III., three gentlemanly ruffians, armed with poniards, and provided with a mantle to muffle their victim, are waiting the signal to consummate the act of perfidy devised by the weak and worthless monarch. The picture cannot but lend its aid to such appreciation of the lawless wickedness of the time as readers may gather from a tale like *A Gentleman of France*.

Historical in another way is Mr. Thomas Smith's "They forged the last link with their lives" (155), a realistic and



gruesome picture representing the last agony of Sir John Franklin's ill-fated companions.

Of subjects purely imaginative, Sir John Millais' "Speak! speak!" (251), is doubtless the most powerful, but admiration will probably struggle with doubt in the spectator's mind as to the story it is intended to tell. A young man starting from sleep is apostrophizing a female form, which, parting the hangings of the bed, confronts him. This is presumably an apparition, but in spite of the somewhat ghostly light which surrounds it, the figure has so earthly a character as almost to preclude the notion. The painting of the jewels which the lady wears, excessive in its brilliant realism, makes it almost impossible to believe that she is meant for a phantom, while the awkwardness of the attitude in which she holds the curtains asunder is suggestive of an amount of effort inconsistent with such a character.

Another spiritualistic subject is attempted by Mr. Dicksee in "A Reverie" (46), which is, however, more noticeable for the daring colour-problem which is attempted. A young lady in white seated at a piano, and a gentleman in evening-dress, are exhibited in the glaring cross-lights of a ruddy fire, and a lamp shining through a yellow shade. The artist was scarcely well-advised to introduce into this lurid but common-place scene a grey spirit form at which the man gazes, typical of the memories stirred within him by the song to which he is listening. "The Smithy" (372), by Mr. Stanhope Forbes, treats a violent contrast of light and shade, which may be sufficiently understood from the title. The drawing of the figures is masterly, but the contrast between the glare from the forge and the sombre gloom of the rest is too extreme to be artistically effective.

A perplexing story is suggested by Mr. Yeame's "Defendant and Counsel" (309), which represents three barristers and another man, presumably a solicitor, severely questioning a dazed and frightened young woman, who we suppose is their client. What it is all about, does not appear, nor why the counsel, though not in court, wear their wigs and gowns.

In "The Swimmer's Pool" (812), Mr. Tuke has scarcely repeated the success of last year's "August Blue." The greenness of the sea is somewhat crude, and the attitude of the figures suggests the idea of photography; nor can it fail to be observed

that he has used precisely the same models as on the former occasion.

It is generally with pleasure that we turn to the landscapes, for there are many hands capable of showing us nature as she is, and as we might see her for ourselves if we had the opportunity, and this in our lack of opportunity is an excellent thing; though there are few who can do what is far better, and show us in nature what we could not see till she be interpreted for us by the genius of another. Of landscapes which are, in the words of old Leitch the water-colourist, "just simple copying from nature," there is an abundance in the present exhibition. Mr. Leader gives us several, all of them, in their measure, good; "Evening" (43), a riverside church and other buildings, in a sunset atmosphere somewhat excessively transparent, "English Cottage Homes" (392), "A Sunday Morning: Surrey" (481), and "Evening Glow" (534), an effective picture, in which the last rays of the sun are caught on the tops of a clump of Scotch firs, standing amid a tract of moorland. Mr. MacWhirter's "Glen Affric, N.B." (196), is a fine representation of a river in spate, harmonizing admirably with the legend from Burns, "Th' incessant roar of headlong tumbling floods." The same artist's "Evening in the Forest, Guisachan" (515), is much impaired by the inexcusably careless drawing of the dead branches in the foreground, otherwise it too would merit high praise. Still more serious is the fault we have to find with his "Beauty and the Beast" (833), under which forced and fanciful title are depicted an elegant, feathery birch-tree and an old oak gnarled and withered. The trees are excellently drawn, but it seems to indicate a lack of true feeling to hold up to contempt an ancient monarch of the forest simply because it has been overtaken by inevitable age, nor can we think that an artist of the higher type would have condescended to such an artifice to attract attention.

In "November Sunshine" (81), Mr. Leslie has set himself one of those difficult tasks to success to which no adequate advantage would appear to attach. From the moods of the month, which is proverbially the least attractive of the year, he has selected one which lights up the landscape with a cold, sickly gleam, making its features oppressively dismal. This effect he has caught with considerable skill, but was it worth while to employ art to convince us how dull and lifeless a landscape can become in the dead season of the year?



Mr. Graham's "The Sea will ebb and flow" (189) is, of course, a painstaking and faithful reproduction of a bit of coast scenery, with rocks stained with seaweed and rough with shell-fish, on which the tide surges and breaks, and has the merit of making us feel as though the scene were present to us, and the salt breeze in our face. It is, however, so precisely of a piece with other works from the same brush, as to lose not a little of its charm. Mr. Sidney Cooper has "Bray on the Thames" (39), "A Summer Afternoon" (52), "Repose" (209), and "The Morning's Inspection" (492), all pleasing, if not very distinguished, but it must be remarked that his figures of cattle, especially in the third piece, have a metallic hardness about them as if drawn from a cast. In "The Thorn" (87), Mr. Alfred Parsons, so well known for his wonderful work with the pen in the delineation of leaves and flowers, has succeeded well in the difficult attempt adequately to represent a may-tree in the full glories of a sheet of blossom, and in the background landscape against which it is set. It is strange, however, that a draughtsman so skilled and careful in this particular department, should have obtruded upon our notice the careless and unshapely blossoms which disfigure the foreground; these being drawn with just sufficient detail to provoke attention which they cannot satisfy. The management of such foregrounds appears indeed to be a standing *crux*, and few are the artists who have discovered the right method of dealing with it. In some instances it appears to have been thought unnecessary to acquire any accurate knowledge concerning flowers before undertaking to represent them. Thus we have a picture entitled "A Daffodil Field" (424), representing a thicket of crimson-blossomed plants about a yard in height. Mr. Henry Moore's "Glen Orchy: a Storm coming on" (201) is perhaps the most striking landscape in the whole collection. Mr. Brett's "The Outlook from my Native Cliffs" (232) is instinct with the indefinable charm of a scene dear to memory.

There are many other landscapes on the walls of the Academy exhibiting in the main the same characteristics as those we have mentioned, many reaching a certain level of merit, and that by no means inconsiderable, but not rising so notably above it as to call for special observation.

Passing from the Academy to the New Gallery, we find on the whole the same general remarks forcing themselves upon us. There are, however, one or two important exceptions. In the

first place we here encounter the work of Sir Edward Burne-Jones, concerning which there can be no doubt either as to the seriousness and elevation of the artist's purpose, or the technical skill which he brings to its accomplishment. But in spite of all it must be confessed, that except for adepts who can duly appreciate the powers exhibited in the workmanship, the result is likely to be disappointing. These lifeless and passionless women, all of one and the same lack-lustre type, and all clad in the same doubtless æsthetic but certainly sombre green, are never interesting and soon grow wearisome, while the action in all the various pieces, if there be action at all, is so limp and languid as in no way to differentiate one from another. In "The Wedding of Psyche" (163), the bridal train would equally suggest a funeral procession, whereas in "The Sleeping Beauty" (106)—a design for the fourth picture in the famous Briar Rose Series—while all will recognize that there is abundance of sleep, none but the initiated are likely to recognize the beauty. The thought cannot but arise in considering such works as these, *non his juvenus orta parentibus*, it was not the sons of such as these that have done anything great in the world, while there is no hint or trace of the higher or more spiritual qualities which, shining through our lower nature, can make us forget the absence of those which are merely earthly. Still more extraordinary, to our mind, is "The Fall of Lucifer: *Vexilla regis prodeunt inferni*" (135), perhaps the most ambitious picture in the whole gallery. Were we not told, it would be utterly impossible to divine what it is, for there is not the faintest symptom of a fall, nor of any quality which we naturally associate with lost angels. Satan and his rebel followers, in the guise of young ladies in man's attire, clad in liveries of holly-green, and bearing folded banners of the same hue, float serene and passionless in the air, no trace of confusion or defeat on their placid features, and might equally well, or equally ill, represent St. Michael and his victorious host. Far more to our liking is Sir Edward's striking, if somewhat *bizarre*, portrait of Dorothy Drew (109), Mr. Gladstone's grand-daughter, "Thou Playmate of my closing day." Another portrait, "The Lady Windsor" (119), is remarkable as showing how in the hands of this artist, the features of all ladies tend to assume that type which appears to dominate his mind.

Another picture which must be noticed is Mr. Frank Brangwyn's "St. Simeon Stylites receiving the Blessed Sacra-

ment" (271). The Saint, on the summit of his column, in the last stage of weakness and emaciation, his back leaning against a post or flagstaff reared at the edge, is visited by a priest with the Holy Eucharist, and attendant acolyte, who have apparently mounted by a ladder on the opposite side. The drawing of these figures is careful and good, but the lugubrious neutral tint of the whole precludes all possibility of either realism or beauty, while the flaming sunset glow on the hills behind is absurd and impossible, and the delineation of the town beneath intolerably bad.

Mr. Shannon's "Kit" (113) is an extreme instance of the liberties which some painters seem to think it advisable occasionally to allow themselves. We have here the vague and shadowy presentment of the head and shoulders of a girl, holding in her hands an animal which may be a dog, a cat, a rabbit, or a guinea-pig, while beneath, apparently to indicate the rest of her figure, are various patches of colour, looking like the scrapings of the painter's palette, laid on with the knife.

"The Laboratory" (238), by the Hon. John Collier, is a singularly powerful, but unpleasant picture. "Erin" (22), by E. Hallé, is a fine specimen of this clever artist's fulness of tone, depth of colour, and power of expression. Mr. Wontner's "Fair Rosamund" is singularly lovely, and is well matched by his "Love Philtre" (37). We cannot recognize the poetical spirit which we are told to find, in Mr. Stott's "Noon-Day" (32), wherein very ordinary country boys are bathing in a very ordinary pool. Mr. Wills' "The Sheep Fold: Twilight" (41) is a fine picture, and Mr. Carr's "Sand Boys" (42) yet finer. Mr. Walter Crane's extraordinary St. George and the Dragon, under the title "England's Emblem" (101), must be seen to be appreciated. "Time the Reaper" (131), by Sir John Millais, is perhaps his most important work of the year, but yet is not all that we expect from his hand. Mr. Holman Hunt's portrait of Miss Gladys Holman Hunt is a painful illustration of the ruin of great powers by artistic crotchets. In "Miss Ada Rehan" (199), Mr. Sargent has set himself one of those hard problems of art which, with Dr. Johnson, we could wish were impossible. What complexion could come safely out of the ordeal of association with a superbly-painted white satin dress and white feather fan? Mr. Britten's "Angels ever bright and fair" (200) is chiefly remarkable for the curious discrepancy between the picture and its title. Three weary-looking figures, apparently

lost on a moor, and dejectedly comparing notes, in spite of the wings attached to their shoulders, nowise suggest anything angelic. Mr. Lance Calkin contributes an excellent portrait of the late J. H. Paul, Esq., M.D. (204). "Our old Cook" (237), by Miss Flora M. Reid, is a refreshingly honest and solid piece of work. "St. John the Baptist" (270), by C. E. Hallé, is full of power, but there is an unpleasant suggestion of want of space on the canvas, and the foreshortening of the right arm can hardly be justified. What can be the meaning of "Echoes" (272), by Miss Maud Beddington? A dozen or so of hideous and ghastly female figures are maundering aimlessly about, all howling. What connection can there be with the sweetest nymph that lives unseen?

Before we leave the New Gallery, we must mention two objects in the Sculpture lobby which have a special interest for Catholics—the bronze bust of His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan, by Mr. Everard Stourton (429), and the medallion portrait of the same, by Mr. W. Charles May (448). Our Cardinal is not easily reproduced, and we cannot think that in either of these works the difficulty has been quite satisfactorily overcome, but the second is undoubtedly the better likeness.

J. G.

## *Education in the Province of Quebec.*

---

### PART II.

IT is well, here and now, to dwell on the point in question. The distinguishing characteristic of education in the Province of Quebec, that which so deeply influences the standard of cost, of salary, of efficiency, is the employment of members of Teaching Congregations. It is evident, on the face of it, that the members of such Orders can live more cheaply, and therefore charge less for teaching, as also for salaries, than any lay person. It is for this reason, as much as for any other, that the salaries of teachers are so small. School Commissioners—except, of course, in very small country places—are inclined to measure the cost of education by what *les Sœurs* or *les Frères* would require. Hence the salaries of male teachers (lay) with diplomas are, at the outside, \$418.75 (£83 15s. 6d.), board not included; without diplomas, \$196.64 (£39 6s. 9d.); that of a "Brother" (in Montreal) being \$250. (£50.) So that it is hardly suprising that there should be, in the province, only 292 male lay teachers, as compared with 1,128 male Religious, and 4,243 female lay teachers. The smallness of the salary fully accounts for the whole matter. It may possibly be hard on those who might otherwise devote themselves to teaching; but it is certainly to the advantage of the very great majority of the population of the province.<sup>1</sup>

Before entering on the question of the efficiency of the teaching Orders, and of the schools in general, it will be well to compare the cost of education in Quebec, first with that in other provinces of the Dominion,<sup>2</sup> and then with that in the "North Atlantic Division" of the United States.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The salaries of male lay teachers in Protestant schools range from \$703.77 (£140 15s. 8d.), to \$599.88 (£120 os. 4d.), but they only number 110, besides 265 in Colleges, Universities, and special schools, whose salaries are not given.

<sup>2</sup> *Year Book*, pp. 465—476.

<sup>3</sup> *United States Education Report*, 1892—93, p. 71.

Province or State.	Average cost per pupil.			
	\$	£	s.	d.
Quebec: on total . . . .	9.30	(1	17	11)
" on average . . . .	12.43	(2	10	1½)
Ontario: on total . . . .	8.67	(1	15	3½)
" on average . . . .	17.09	(3	8	8½)
Nova Scotia: on total . . . .	7.68	(1	11	6)
" on average . . . .	13.00	(2	12	6)
New Brunswick: on total . . . .	6.08	(1	4	6)
" on average . . . .	12.29	(2	9	9½)
British Columbia: <sup>1</sup> on total . . . .	14.178	(2	19	11)
" on average . . . .	26.66	(5	5	11) <sup>2</sup>
Prince Edward Island: on total . . . .	6.66	(1	5	11)
" on average . . . .	11.52	(2	6	3)
Maine <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	15.46	(3	1	11)
New Hampshire . . . . .	19.55	(3	18	10½)
Vermont . . . . .	16.38	(3	5	9)
Massachusetts . . . . .	32.83	(6	12	2½)
Rhode Island . . . . .	34.27	(6	17	10½)
Connecticut . . . . .	26.74	(5	7	2)
New York . . . . .	27.59	(5	11	0½)
New Jersey . . . . .	26.35	(5	5	7½)
Pennsylvania . . . . .	20.22	(4	0	11)

It will be seen that the cost of education in Quebec is lower for the average attendance, than Ontario, Nova Scotia, and British Columbia, and only slightly higher than New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. It is also worthy of attention that the difference between the average cost for the total number of pupils and that for the average attendance is smaller than in any other province, this being, of course, due to the fact that the average attendance in Quebec, 75 per cent., is the highest in the Dominion. It is most evident that the Canadian system (British Columbia excepted), by which parents and municipalities bear their share of the expense, is far less costly than the American, and the average attendance for the Dominion, 55.4, does not compare unfavourably with that for the North Atlantic Division of the United States, 66.0, especially

<sup>1</sup> For Manitoba no statistics are to be obtained.

<sup>2</sup> "The lowest amount, in both cases, since 1881. The whole of the expenditure is borne by the Government." (*Year Book*, p. 475, sec. 818.) This last fact is commended to the notice of the ardent supporters of State Education. The population of British Columbia is 98,173. (*Year Book*, p. 91, sec. 119.)

<sup>3</sup> The United States figures give the "average expenditure per pupil for the whole school year." (*United States Education Report*, 1892-93, p. 71.) The highest average expenditure is in Idaho, viz., \$47.15. (£9 9s. 3½d.)

when it is remembered that the average for Quebec, 75 per cent (74·84 exactly), is higher than the best in the latter, namely 72·9 for Maine.

Next to the questions of average attendance and of cost, comes that of efficiency. An obvious and, at the same time, simple test of the efficiency of any school system, is to take the percentage of illiterates. Judged by this standard, that of the Province of Quebec would seem to be less efficient than might have been expected. The schools are reasonably numerous, 5,640 for a school population of 275,969,<sup>1</sup> with a total of 9,032 teachers, and, as already shown, a very high average attendance. And yet the percentage of illiterates in the Province of Quebec is greater than in any other province of the Dominion. The numbers are as follows:<sup>2</sup>

	Unable to read.	Unable to write.
New Brunswick . . .	7·70	10·20
Nova Scotia . . .	7·36	10·40
Ontario . . .	3·83	5·20
Quebec . . .	14·80	18·02

It may be as well, before attempting to account for such a state of affairs, to add certain remarks made by the author of the Census Bulletin. In the first place, "there has been a decrease (1·30 per cent.) in the percentage of those who cannot read and of those who cannot write (2·48 per cent.);" ". . . The proportionate decrease in the number of those who cannot write is considerably greater than in the number of those unable to read."<sup>3</sup> ". . . The population of Quebec between ten and twenty years has made rapid strides with respect to the advance of its adult population. As a matter of fact, their advance has been greater than that of any similar group in any of the other provinces. . . . It is the most satisfying fact brought out by this study of the census figures relating to education."<sup>4</sup>

Judging by the words of this Report, Quebec, however backward in the past or even in the present, should, if the progress already begun continues, be able, at no very distant period, to bear comparison on this head, as on those of cost and of average attendance, with any of the other provinces.

<sup>1</sup> *Rep. Supt. Publ. Instr.* p. viii.

<sup>2</sup> Census of Canada, 1891. Bulletin, No. 17, 1893 (the figures refer to the four original provinces), p. 9. The United States census returns on this subject are not yet printed (for 1891).

<sup>3</sup> Bulletin, p. 10. The periods compared are 1871 and 1891.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 22.



What, it may be asked, are the causes of this high percentage of illiteracy? It will be only necessary to refer to two or three Reports of School Inspectors in order to answer the question fully. It will be shown that the causes are not only simple and adequate, but also such as, with time and diligent effort—including certain necessary reforms—may be removed.

The following table of length of attendance, shows plainly the first reason of the afore-mentioned backwardness.

Here is an average report :<sup>1</sup>

Total number of pupils,	5,065.
Average attendance .	3,304 (65.25 per cent.)
First year pupils . . . .	43 per cent.
Second " . . . .	23 "
Third " . . . .	24 "
Fourth " . . . .	5 "
Fifth " . . . .	2 "
Sixth " . . . .	1 "

The rapid decrease in the number of pupils in one class is due :

1. To the parents not sufficiently appreciating the advantages of education. As a rule they may be said to send their children to school only to get rid of them when they are too young to be useful at home, or when they reach their tenth year, in order to prepare them for their First Communion. When that is over, they soon take them away. . . .

Such a custom, of itself, would be sufficient to account for the high percentage of illiteracy in the province. The remedy is, unfortunately, not quite so simple as the disease. It may safely be commended to the consideration of the advocates of compulsory education, that compulsion is not always successful. Compulsion, in Ontario, produces an average attendance of 51 per cent., as compared with 75 per cent. in Quebec. The remedy, whatever it is, must eventually be applied by the parents, with whom rests, not only the right, but also the duty of educating their children. As already shown, the improvement in this respect during the last twenty years, has been very marked.

It must, moreover, not be forgotten that Quebec is, chiefly, an agricultural province. The temptation to parents engaged in farm or field labour to shorten, as far as possible, the stay of their children at school, is naturally a very strong one. Only a

<sup>1</sup> *Rep. Suft. Publ. Instr.* pp. 22, 24.



law limiting the employment of children to those who have passed a certain school standard, would in any way alter the state of matters; but there is no evidence of any inclination on the part of the ecclesiastical or State authorities to propose such an enactment. The local clergy are most energetic in inculcating the duty of regular attendance, but without complete success. In a comparatively poor and, to a considerable extent (in many districts), a migratory population, the difficulty is one that seems likely to continue for a long time to come.

There is, further, another and very important cause to account for the inefficiency of many of the country schools, namely, the extreme smallness of the salaries paid. Quebec as a province is comparatively poor, some of the country municipalities are excessively so. Further, since the school commissioners for each municipality are chosen in the municipality itself, the conception of what constitutes an adequate salary is apt to vary with each locality. One Inspector remarks: "Here there is but one object in view respecting the engagement of masters; that is, to get them at the lowest possible price, irrespective of the qualification of the teacher. The taxpayers get the value of their money."<sup>1</sup> Another expresses much the same opinion: "Is it reasonable to expect to attract to teaching young persons who have received such a high education as a good teacher should have, by offering advantages that a domestic would refuse with disdain!<sup>2</sup> Is it possible to imagine that an educated man would lend himself to the ungrateful task of instructing youth for a salary that an ordinary copying clerk or even a shopman would not accept."<sup>3</sup>

The results of this smallness of salary are, of course, a lowered standard of capacity among female teachers in the first place, and a constant change of teachers in the second. As to the former, out of a total of 4,143 female lay teachers, no

<sup>1</sup> *Rep. Supt. Publ. Instr.* p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> A salary, for example, of \$7.50 (£1 10s.) a month, *without* board. The wages of a good general servant range from £2 per month, upwards, with board and lodging. The highest salary paid to a female teacher with diploma is \$108.51 (£21 14s. 6d.) a year; without diploma, \$73.19 (£14 13s. 3½d.). (*Ibid.* p. xi.)

<sup>3</sup> The highest salary of a male lay teacher, with a diploma, is \$418.75 (£83 15s. 6d.), but the ordinary salary is that of a "Religious," namely, \$250 (£50.) The salary of a teacher without diploma is \$196.64 (£19 5s. 10d.) The highest salary is, of course, paid only in large cities. It is not merely, therefore, a question of making the salary of the "Religious" the standard, but rather that, without the teaching Congregations there would either be, practically, no male teachers, or that the expenses would be increased to a very formidable extent.

fewer than 1,003, or 24.20 per cent., are without diplomas; in one district they number 41 per cent.,<sup>1</sup> in another, 52 out of a total of 143.<sup>2</sup> Cheapness has, of course, a great deal to do with the matter. Moreover, even teachers possessing a diploma do not always seem to prove as satisfactory as those who wish to impose this test on the teaching Congregations might be supposed to desire. One Inspector comments on this point:<sup>3</sup> "I cannot close my report without drawing your attention to a too well-known evil, viz., the too great facility with which female teachers obtain their diplomas from certain Boards of Examiners. Some girls, refused by the Board in Montreal, immediately apply to this or that Board and obtain a first-class diploma." It is, probably, with reference to such *diplômées* that the following was written:<sup>4</sup> "As our female teachers in general seem to think that they have exhausted the reservoir of human learning by the little they are obliged to learn to obtain a diploma authorizing them to teach in elementary schools, they study no more, . . . they teach in a barely intelligent manner. . . ." Surely, the "reformers," notwithstanding the rules, the discipline, the constant, never-ceasing training, and the accumulated experience of the teaching Congregations, offer a guarantee of capacity far more real and far more satisfactory than any diploma of a Government Board of Examiners. To force the "Religious" to submit to the latter, would be—prejudice apart—something like subjecting a University "honour-man" to examination by a board appointed by a parish council.

That the smallness of salaries should, in the second place, lead to a constant change of teachers, is only what might be expected. A young girl, on leaving the convent, will "teach school" for a few months or a few years, by way of temporary occupation, and, if she lives with relatives or friends may, possibly, save a little money. She is, at least, free from the reproach of idleness, and is more or less "independent." But the charm does not, in the majority of cases, last very long, as the following figures show:<sup>5</sup>

Teachers for one year	.	.	.	69 per cent.
" two years	.	.	.	16 "
" three years	.	.	.	9 "
" four to seven years	.	.	.	4 "
" over seven years	.	.	.	2 "

<sup>1</sup> *Ref. Supt. Publ. Instr.* p. 24. <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 5. <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 41. <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 11.

<sup>5</sup> *Rept.* ut sup. p. 25.

With such constant changes of teachers how can any school be really efficient?

That many schools, even in country districts, are thoroughly efficient, there can be no doubt. "Contrary to the notion formed by a certain number of persons who are not informed as to the knowledge imparted in our minor schools, it can be stated, without fear of mistake, that our elementary schools are in no way inferior to schools of the same class in other provinces."<sup>1</sup> This may seem an optimistic view, but it is, unquestionably, true of a very large proportion of the elementary schools of the province.

According to another Inspector, out of a total of 134 schools,<sup>2</sup> 38 are marked "excellent," 46 "very good," 24 "good," and 11 "fair;" a record that might do credit to a school district in any country. Such examples might be multiplied, but it would be unnecessary to do so.

As a rule, the schools in towns and large cities are everything that could be wished; and, whether in cities or in country districts, the schools taught by members of the different teaching Orders are, invariably, superior to all others. All the reports of the different Inspectors concur in this. Apart then from the cheapness of education due to the employment of Religious—in itself, no small boon to a poor country—the schools taught by them are, undoubtedly, the standard of efficiency.

As to "higher education," there are, in the province, 444 model schools (Catholic), 117 academies, 2 normal schools, 17 classical colleges, and 2 universities. In all of these education is, comparatively, as cheap as in the elementary schools. Complaints are made, especially by certain "reformers," who owe such education as they possess to these very colleges, that the instruction given is too "classical" and not sufficiently "practical." As a matter-of-fact, "In more than one half of our classical colleges, the studies begin with a complete commercial course. The colleges . . . have, *to begin with*, commercial courses; then, when this course is finished, those who are destined to the liberal professions, pass to the classical course; if they leave before they have finished, it is not the fault of the priest if they are *declassés*."<sup>3</sup>

"Moreover, in our cities, we have commercial colleges, where a course is made, I do not say equal, but superior to that of any

<sup>1</sup> *Rept.* ut sup. p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 31.

<sup>3</sup> *Le Prêtre*, pp. 91, 92.

business college. . . . In our country districts, there is hardly a county, where, in the large parishes, there is not found a 'model academy,' wherein a high standard of arithmetic and book-keeping is taught."<sup>1</sup>

These are simply statements of well-known facts. There is, indeed, nothing more remarkable in the educational system of the Province of Quebec than the number and efficiency of the different academies and classical colleges. In cities they are, as a rule, taught by members of the teaching Orders, in the country villages, by the local clergy. In brief, whatever may be the short-comings of a certain percentage of the elementary schools, the establishments for higher education can bear comparison with those of any other country. To the objection made by "reformers" and "priest-eaters," that the colleges of the English-speaking community are superior to those of the French, the answer given is much to the point: "You desire schools that will give you practical men. . . . It is very simple:—*Build them.* . . . The English are very practical. In their wills they leave almost always something for the cause of education. . . . There is something practical."<sup>2</sup>

To conclude: The fundamental principle of the system of Education in the Province of Quebec, is the supreme and inalienable right of the parent to decide on the manner and matter of his children's education. Hence, anything more than a nominal compulsion would be regarded as an unjustifiable interference with the right of the parent. Further "free" education is looked upon first as preventing the fulfilment of an imperative parental duty, namely, that of paying for the education of the children; and secondly, it is argued, not without reason, that the Government which gives "free" education is sure to exaggerate its "right" to decide of what nature that education shall be. And such Government "rights," it is held, are wholly incompatible, in this matter, with the divinely given rights of the parents. The last, but by no means the least important reason, for objecting to "free" education is, that it is vastly more expensive than the present system, and not necessarily more efficient.

The merits of the system of elementary education are, first its small cost, both to the parents and to the Government; secondly, its careful preservation of the most complete liberty of conscience; thirdly, the high average attendance, 75 per cent.;

<sup>1</sup> *Le Prêtre*, pp. 92, 93.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 105, 106.

and, fourthly, the fact of a very marked decrease, during the last twenty years, of the percentage of illiteracy, the best proof possible of the general efficiency of the schools.

The faults of the system are few and obvious. Parents send their children to school too young, and take them away too soon. The salaries paid are, as a rule, much too small, which is due principally, it may be said solely, to the cheapness of the education provided by the Religious Orders. Smallness of salary leads to a constant change of teachers, which is, of course, highly detrimental to the efficiency of the school.<sup>1</sup>

The establishments for higher education are numerous and excellent, those especially, which are kept by members of the clergy or of the teaching Orders. Exemption from taxation is a very small return for the enormous amounts saved in the cost of education;<sup>2</sup> exemption from examination is simply a recognition of the undeniable fact that the rules of such Orders offer far better guarantees of efficiency than a diploma granted, as is often the case, by some incompetent country Board of Examiners.

Altogether, at a time when Education, and "denominational" education especially, seems to be of absorbing interest to so many, the system of the Province of Quebec is well worthy of careful study and attention.

FRANCIS W. GREY.

<sup>1</sup> The principle familiar to American country politicians, of "giving every man a turn," seems to have extended itself to Quebec country School Commissioners. At least, there are frequent complaints on the part of Inspectors of the dismissal of teachers without adequate cause. Which looks, it must be said, as if it were done in favour of some one with what Americans aptly call "a pull."

<sup>2</sup> The same is true of charitable institutions, asylums, hospitals, &c. The saving of cost is simply incalculable.

### *The Duchess Bona's Indulgence.*

---

LORD HALIFAX, in his now famous Bristol Address, enumerates the causes of the great sixteenth century schism, and assigns a foremost place among them to "the prevailing divorce between religion and morals which was so characteristic a feature of the fifteenth century." There were false religious conceptions then commonly entertained, which caused men to imagine they could get the value out of religious observances and so save their souls, even though meanwhile they were freely indulging in the grossest moral delinquencies. The effect of these abominable notions was to set side by side punctilious discharge of religious offices with notoriously evil lives, whilst, worst of all, the rulers of the Church, instead of condemning and warring against the scandal, sanctioned it with their approval and even participated in it. Lord Halifax's contention is that the schism sprang from the indignant revolt of the earnest minds of the age against this general demoralization, and that on these grounds it was largely excusable, although he thinks it was a misfortune that men confounded the incrustation of abuses which had gathered round the system of the (Roman) Catholic Church with the genuine system itself.

We do not think this theory can be maintained. The movement conventionally called the Reformation was *au fond* doctrinal, not ethical, in its intentions, and, as doctrinal, was a revolt not so much against alleged popular abuses, as against the authentic teaching of the Catholic Church. If the movement had also, and necessarily, its ethical side, this was not a side on which its leaders could afford to look, or did look, with much satisfaction; as we know from their own lips—from Bradford, for instance, in England, and from Luther in Germany. Nor again can it be said that the moral and religious earnestness of Europe found its best representatives among the divines and the princes who originated and maintained the schism.

We are not, however, proposing to deal with this comprehensive question in its entirety in the present article. Lord Halifax, in the development of his thought, lays stress on the doctrine of Indulgences. He maintains that indulgences, as *then* understood, manifestly lent themselves to the above described divorce between religion and morality, and became a downright incentive to sin; and he cites a particular instance as an illustration of what he means. It is with this instance we desire to deal. He introduces it in the following passage:

It was the revolt in the fifteenth century against what seemed to be this acquiescence on the part of the authorities of the Church in a divorce between religion and morals to which the schism of the sixteenth century was in great part due. Apart from theological controversies, there can be no doubt that Indulgences, as then preached, were practically what Cardinal Egidio did not hesitate to call them—an incentive to sin and a danger to souls. When Bona, widow of Galeazzo Sforza, after her husband's murder, could submit a case to the theologians at Paris to know if the Pope could give a plenary remission from Purgatory to one who had died unrepentant, and was described as, *Symmonias fecit scandalosas et notorias; violavit virgines; aliorum uxores accepit; scelera infinita more tyrannorum perpetravit*, and the Paris doctors answered Yes, can we wonder that the religious earnestness of Europe revolted, and that the apparent sanction on the part of ecclesiastical authority of such a divorce of religion from morality brought about the catastrophe of the schism, and with it the dissolution of Western Christendom?

Here we have the case of a man who having led a grossly evil life dies unrepentant, and must, therefore, according to all Christian teaching, Catholic as well as Protestant, be lost beyond hope of redemption. Nevertheless, his widow is assured that the Pope can deliver him at once by the grant of a Plenary Indulgence; and, although the term used is "plenary remission from Purgatory," remission from Hell must be intended, since it is into Hell, not Purgatory, that his impenitence must have cast him. Do we exceed in saying that to conceive thus of the efficacy of an indulgence, a *post mortem* indulgence, is to convert it into an incentive to sin and a danger to souls? Must not the inevitable tendency of such a system be to encourage a sinner to persist in his wickedness? If he could obtain the fruits of repentance by a posthumous indulgence, would it not present itself to his depraved mind as superfluous



to undergo the irksomeness of repentance during life? And yet the theologians who gave this abominable advice were the theologians of Paris, of the most learned University at that time in the world; and worse still the Pope himself, it was assumed, would find no difficulty in acceding to the request.

If this account is correct, we must all consider the transaction to have been very scandalous and distressing. But is it correct? So often these terrible stories prove on examination to rest on some misconception. May not this be the case in the present instance? As Lord Halifax has kindly obtained for us the reference on which his informant had relied, we are able to answer the question.

Galeazzo Sforza succeeded his father Francesco in the Dukedom of Milan in 1466. He was young, and had not learned to control his inclinations, and so when he came into possession of absolute power he proved himself to be a lustful, cruel, and oppressive tyrant. The passage which Lord Halifax cites does not misdescribe him. At the same time he seems to have displayed some good qualities along with the bad, and a contemporary writer characterizes him as "a monster of vices and virtues." To this better side of his character we must attribute his warm attachment to his pious and devoted wife, Bona of Savoy, who stood like a good angel at his side, and not unfrequently succeeded in persuading him to forego some evil purpose. "Sweet-tempered, patient, and winning, Bona acquired much influence over her whimsical and capricious-minded husband. Aghast at his excesses, she made herself a mediator in the cause of clemency, and implored mercy for the miserable prisoner under sentence of death. In March, 1474, the prisons, the secret chambers, and the dungeons under the tower in all the castles of the Sforzas were filled. In many places the gallows were seen in course of erection. There was general consternation, and general indignation 'when the Duke (writes Campio), at the prayer of the Duchess, caused a general pardon to be published.' Only a few were retained in their fetters, and no blood was seen to flow. From that day onwards, the name of Bona remained in benediction throughout the duchy."<sup>1</sup> We may presume also that the same gentle influence was at times successfully exercised to induce him to make his peace with God and resolve on some amendment of his life. For we shall hear presently, from Bona's own lips, that he did from time to

<sup>1</sup> Pasolini, *Vita de Caterina Sforza*, i. p. 34.



time approach the sacraments, although, alas, as is usual with sinners of his class, only to relapse again into his evil ways. His end came in the form of a Nemesis. A few misguided men persuaded themselves that they would be doing a heroic deed in ridding Milan of its tyrant, and they assassinated Galeazzo as he entered the Cathedral, on St. Stephen's day, 1476, to hear Mass. They gave him five stabs in vital parts with their daggers, and he expired almost immediately, with the words, *O nostra Donna*—"O our Lady," on his lips.

Galeazzo's eldest son, John Galeazzo, being at the time of his father's death a child of eight, the Regency devolved on his mother, the Duchess Bona. Shortly after the tragedy she consulted some theologians on a point of conscience, and, guided by their decision, sent in a petition to the Pope. The evidence for this is in two documents discovered in the National Library at Paris by Pasolini, the recent biographer of Caterina Sforza, who was a natural daughter of Galeazzo. One is a letter written by Bona to Don Celso de Mafeis, Canon Regular of the Lateran, her agent at Rome, the person charged to lay her petition before the Pope; the other is the petition itself, drawn up doubtless by the theologians to whom she had submitted her case of conscience. These theologians, we may remark incidentally, do not appear to have been doctors of Paris, and probably belonged to Milan. What has led to connecting them with Paris is the discovery of the documents in the Paris Library. But Pasolini explains that they got there, along with other papers relating to the Sforza family, merely through purchase, the vendor, Costa de Beauregard, having been the possessor of the Castle of La Sforzesca. This, however, is a point of small consequence.

Pasolini in his Appendix, where he transcribes the two documents, gives the following summary of their contents, evidently from the Catalogue of the National Library:

Bona of Savoy, Duchess of Milan, consults a committee of casuists to know if she can obtain from the Pope a posthumous absolution in favour of a man who has been guilty of every crime, and was cut off by an unprovided death. She promises in return to build churches and monasteries on the sites which have been the scenes of the excesses which she enumerates. These two curious documents witness to the *naïve* faith and to the tender and pious affection of Bona of Savoy for her unworthy husband, Galeazzo Maria Sforza, assassinated by Lampugnano.

It is evidently this summary which has misled Lord Halifax's informant, for it speaks of a "posthumous absolution" and suggests, though it does not directly say, that Galeazzo died impenitent. We shall see, however, that as regards both these points the summary misrepresents the documents.

The Petition runs as follows :

Titius<sup>1</sup> often engaged in unlawful wars and depredations; laid waste many properties and drove out their possessors; invaded the territory of the Church in a hostile manner; neglected to do justice; was deliberately guilty of injustice; levied new tolls, even on churches and ecclesiastical persons; was also frequently guilty of scandalous and notorious simony; outraged virgins; carried off the wives of other men, and committed many, nay innumerable, acts of wickedness after the manner of tyrants, &c., and was the cause *sine qua non*, by enjoining or commanding and recommending that such crimes and many others most grievous in their nature should be committed [by other men]; and this notwithstanding the many Bulls, Absolutions, and Indulgences he had obtained from the Apostolic See, viz., from the Supreme Pontiffs Eugenius (and) Nicholas.<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless Lia, his wife and heiress, together with her children, having been prudently instructed by wise and conscientious men, that "sin is not remitted, &c.,"<sup>3</sup> having in view both the injuries, certain and uncertain, done to ecclesiastical persons, and the uncertain injuries of whatever kind done to secular persons, prostrate at the feet of our Most Holy Lord, begs that through the compassion of the Apostolic See and out of the plenitude of its power, she may receive a liberal remission of all the aforesaid [injuries done]; on this understanding, however, that she be bound to pay a stated sum for the Crusade and for the building and endowment of churches, monasteries, and hospitals; and likewise to provide marriage portions for poor maidens, and to establish other pious institutions for the places and the persons where and against whom the aforesaid crimes have been committed; and further in her own person to undergo fasts and other penances; protesting, moreover, that she will arrange for the certain injuries to the extent of her power, and will come to an agreement with the creditors, both by satisfying them and asking for delays, and by granting them remission of other customary burdens. So that by this absolution her conscience may be freed and be safe; and that she may always be in the state [? of tranquillity] with her children, and may be able to pass safely out

<sup>1</sup> The indefinite names Titius and Lia are employed, according to the usual custom, to preserve secrecy. The theologians had considered the case without reference to the identity of the persons concerned, and as such it was sent up to Rome.

<sup>2</sup> There seems to be some omission here, though Pasolini does not indicate it.

<sup>3</sup> i.e., "The sin is not remitted unless restitution is made"—*Non remittitur peccatum nisi restituatur ablatum.*

of this life. And that, *if her husband should have died in the state of grace*, by these absolutions and satisfactions he may the more easily be rescued from the pains of Purgatory.

The reader will have seen already that this petition by no means answers to the account given of it in the Bristol Address. So far from asking for a posthumous indulgence for one who died unrepentant, it does not ask for any indulgence at all, and in the single sentence in which hope is expressed that the dead man may derive spiritual benefit from what is sought and promised, this possibility of benefit is explicitly assumed to be dependent on the possibility of his having died repentant. The Duke before expiring had just been able to utter a prayer to our Blessed Lady, and naturally his widow found in this great hope and consolation. But a few comments on the petition will make its nature still more clear.

Let us get out of our heads altogether that it asks for an absolution either from the guilt or the punishment of sin. "Absolution" here means what in English we should call a "discharge"—a discharge, under certain conditions, from all further obligations to restitution. The Duchess, with her children, has succeeded to the inheritance of the dead man. Reflecting on the many acts of robbery and violence of which the late Duke had been guilty, and for which his property had been chargeable with the burden of restitution, she asks herself whether she and her children, as the present holders of the property, are not bound to carry the restitution into effect. To relieve her conscience she consults experienced theologians, who assure her that the obligation exists. But there is still a difficulty. How is it to be made? The injurious acts had been innumerable, and in most cases it was not possible to say who had been the precise victims and what had been the precise extent of the injury. To whom, then, and in what form, was the restitution to be made? Her theologians instruct her in the most scientific manner. In the first place she must distinguish between injuries done to the Church, in her clergy and her possessions, and the injuries done to lay persons. As regards the former, the Holy See being, in virtue of its plenary power, the supreme administrator of Church property and interests, she should make an estimate of the injury done and of her powers to restore, and then supplicate the Holy See to judge whether her offer was sufficient, and, if it so seemed, to accept it as such.

As regards the injuries done to lay persons, she must again distinguish between those in which the victims were known and those in which they were unknown. When the persons injured were known, she must approach them and come to an arrangement with them, either by paying the debts straight off, or by begging for a delay, or, where it was feasible, by remitting a proportionate amount of the taxes to which they were otherwise liable. In the case of persons injured who were unknown, she should again refer to the Pope and ask him to sanction the application of a suitable sum to works of charity. This counsel is based on the teaching of the moral theologians, that when stolen goods cannot be returned to the owner they should be given to some work of charity, but in no case retained by the unjust possessor. The Pope is here applied to as the supreme administrator of all works of charity ; works of charity, according to the Catholic conception, being works of piety, and falling under ecclesiastical administration, at least in the last resort. When another has been injured in his goods or person, beyond the obligation of repairing the damage done, is the liability to receive appropriate punishment for the guilt of the crime. This also the Duchess has in view, and so proposes to take upon herself fasts and other penances. It might, indeed, be thought that this department of her husband's liabilities could not reasonably be held to descend by inheritance. But such a thought accords more with the ideas of the present day than with those of the fifteenth century.

Returning to Bona's plans for restitution, we may notice the objects on which she fixes. First, she proposes to give a stated sum for the Crusade. From the other documents which will be given presently, it appears that some preliminary communications had already been interchanged between Bona and Sixtus IV., and that this Pope had desired to see a large portion of the sum restored applied to the Crusade. It was most reasonable. Following in the footsteps of his three predecessors, Callixtus III., Pius II., and Paul II., Sixtus IV. had perceived clearly the peril of Christendom to which the secular princes of the day were so unaccountably blind. His great object was to preserve Europe from the advance of the Turkish power, which was threatening to enslave the remainder of Christendom as it had already enslaved its Eastern portion. He was therefore begging for help in men and money in all directions. As there was this money owing to the Church from the Duchess Bona, it

was only natural he should indicate the Crusade as the special object to which it should be devoted.

Bona, however, after the manner of Italian princes, was apparently less alive to the urgency of the Turkish danger, and was desirous that her restitution money should be applied to good works more directly beneficial to those injured by her husband's misconduct. Hence she begs to be allowed to spend the greater part on churches, monasteries, hospitals, pensions, and other objects, within her own dominion. In this desire she was only following the instincts of a right conscience which should endeavour to make restitution as nearly as possible to the persons injured. At the same time, for the reasons mentioned, Pope Sixtus was justified in asserting the prior claims of the Crusade. On the one hand, the persons to whom the restitution was due were mostly not definitely ascertainable; on the other, the public danger was great.

At the very end of the petition, and then only, reference is made to the profit which the Duchess hopes her husband's soul may derive from the fulfilment of her good intentions. In this particular document she does not, as has been said, solicit an indulgence on his behalf, although she does in the other document to which we shall come presently. What she does here is merely to give expression to her hopes that the discharge of her husband's obligations which she is contemplating, and which she desires the Holy See, as representing the parties injured, to accept, may avail to satisfy in some measure for the temporal punishment he is enduring, *if indeed, as she hopes, he was so happy as to die in the grace of God.* The belief underlying this hope is the accepted and cherished belief of the Catholic Church; for it is the belief that, in virtue of the Communion of Saints, the satisfactory value of penitential and other good works will be accepted by God for the souls of our departed friends; it is the same belief to which Gregory II. gave authoritative expression: "The supreme goodness and clemency of God must be greatly praised and thanked for having granted it as a privilege to human weakness that a man might have the power to satisfy for his neighbour, a power which specially appertains to this branch of penance [namely, to prayers, fasts, and alms, &c.]"<sup>1</sup>

There is one further point in the petition which needs a word of comment, lest it should be misunderstood by a non-Catholic reader. The Duchess mentions that her husband had

<sup>1</sup> *Cat. Rom. De Pœn. Sacr.* n. 76.

obtained from the Apostolic See many "Bulls, Absolutions, and Indulgences." Does not this look as if he had thought by these to obtain a remission without amendment of his wicked life? Certainly not. In the petition the mention of these grants is introduced as though the fact of his having sought and obtained them were an aggravating circumstance in his guilt. In the letter to Don Celso,<sup>1</sup> they are again mentioned, but there they seem to be referred to as having afforded evidence of the reality of his repentance. There is no inconsistency between the two allegations. That he should have sought them in his seasons of repentance when, according to the letter, he had first made a good confession, was proof of his earnestness at the time. That after receiving these special graces he should have relapsed into his sins was an aggravation of his guilt. But what was the nature of the graces? By "Indulgences" are most probably meant indulgences such as we are concerned with. Having obtained through a good confession and sacramental absolution remission of guilt and of eternal punishment, he desired, as any Catholic would desire, to be delivered also from his temporal punishment, from all or some of it. By the other terms, "Absolutions," "Bulls," most likely something distinct is meant, though we cannot say precisely what. Several things might be covered by these phrases—for instance, such discharges as his widow was seeking through the petition. Or he might be seeking absolution from excommunication incurred by aggression on the ecclesiastical domain. As Eugenius and Nicholas are mentioned among the Popes who gave them, and of these the former died when Galeazzo was four years old and the latter when he was twelve, presumably some were rather spiritual privileges such as are often granted as special favours to special individuals and families.

We may now turn to the other document, the covering letter to Don Celso, the agent at Rome. It is written to instruct him how to back up the petition when he lays it before the Pope. It runs, naturally, over the same ground as the petition, but includes more and enters into further details. It is, therefore, useful, in confirming our estimate of the nature of the application made in the petition. It runs thus:

Venerable and religious man, our most beloved Father in Christ.

To carry out the plan recommended in your presence by those Fathers, regulars and seculars, we send you for your guidance the

<sup>1</sup> *Vide infra*, p. 183.



following instructions, in conformity with which you will use all possible skill and prudence in inducing our Most Holy Lord to listen to our just desires. Please also assure him of my devoted attachment, as you have always been used to do, and let me know at once by letter how much you have been able to obtain; not, however, coming to an agreement as to the [definite] sum of money without our knowledge. Farewell. . . .

Considering in how many secular transactions he [Galeazzo] was engaged, by wars lawful and unlawful, by sacking, robbing, and otherwise devastating districts, by extortion from subjects, by neglect of justice and at times [even] by deliberate injustice, by fresh impositions of customs levied even on the clergy; by carnal vices, notorious and scandalous simonies, and other innumerable sins of various kinds; and that although he accused himself in confession of all these (sins) at the prescribed times, and, as we believe, with care so far as his own recollection and knowledge enabled him to do, changed [his life] so far as to say many devout prayers, and was solicitous at such times to obtain Absolution, Bulls, and Graces from the Apostolic See for the remission of his sins, which, moreover, he well recognized and grieved over;<sup>1</sup> nevertheless, considering the terrible manner of his death, so sad and sudden, when, however, he *showed some signs of contrition*, in regard of which we firmly believe that, through the mercy of God, he died in grace and that his soul can profit by suffrages and other spiritual aids; we cannot let our mind rest until we have done everything possible to deliver this unhappy soul from the pains of Purgatory. And because, following the sacred theologians, we believe with them firmly that His Holiness, in whose person the power of Christ is ministerially exercised [*se rappresenta*], can grant and bestow grace [of remission] to us who are on earth and in this present life, for the sake of one of our [friends] who may be in Purgatory, especially when there is a just cause for such a concession, we betake ourselves to the feet of His Holiness with the fullest devotion and faith. Supplicating Him, if He thinks fitting, in virtue of the plenitude [*i.e.* plenary power] of the Apostolic See, and from the treasure of the Blood of Christ and the merits of the Saints, to grant us a special grace and plenary liberation and remission for the soul of the aforesaid lord, our former consort.

Here is the request for a plenary indulgence. It was not inserted in the petition, probably because it would have been unbusinesslike to include in the petition two requests so disparate as a request for a plenary indulgence and a request

<sup>1</sup> "De li quali tuti quantunque a li tempi debiti se confesasse, et credimo che cum diligentia quanto gli bastava il proprio discorso e sapere, se tonasse (*sic*) faciendo quotidiane oratione molto divote, e fusse solcito a le fiare de obtinere absolutione, bolle, et gratie apostolice, per remissione de peccati soy de li quali pur era assai cognoscente et dolente."

for a discharge from further obligation to make restitution. And as it is not found in the petition, the presumption is that the Duchess did not include her desire for the plenary indulgence in the matters she laid before her council of theologians. Why should she? Their aid was called in to solve a difficult question, the question as to the form and amount of restitution required, whereas there was no doubt whatever as to the Pope's power to grant a plenary indulgence for the soul of the dead man. This observation is important, for what seemed so scandalous in the story as it is presented in the Bristol Address was that an indulgence, alleged to be of so outrageous a character, should have been sanctioned by a learned body of theologians. We now see that whatever may be our view of its character, the theologians had nothing to do with it. We see, however, as well, that nothing outrageous was sought. The indulgence was to conform itself to the ordinary conditions of indulgences, as they are understood and practised at the present day. It was for the soul of one who was considered to have shown distinct signs of penitence, and this circumstance is expressly recited in the grounds on which it is solicited.

After this interruption to comment on the request for a plenary indulgence, we may return to the letter, which continues as follows :

And we [on our part] will pay for the defence of the Holy Faith . . . ducats, which we supplicate Him [the Pope] if He thinks fit, to estimate and take as an equivalent for all that this lord, our former consort, was obliged to restore to whatever church or ecclesiastic, for goods [unjustly taken], both certain and uncertain, to which he would have been bound and obliged in conscience ; engaging ourselves to His Holiness for our part, that, He having said to our orator, Miser Jo. Giacomo Rizo, in a similar case, that "sin is not remitted unless that which was unjustly taken is restored," and that His Holiness did not intend to relieve others from their obligation by taking it upon Himself, we intend, to the full extent of our power, in order that in course of time we may obtain that grace and remission, either to come to an agreement with, or effectually to restore to and satisfy, all those who appear to be certain creditors, so that they may not have occasion to lament, and that we will arrange to do it as secretly and with as little scandal as possible. We supplicate His Holiness, if He thinks the above-mentioned sum fit to be paid by us in view of the certain and uncertain ecclesiastical [claims], to accept it as an equivalent and devote it to the aforesaid defence of the holy faith, under the species and pretext of the subsidy which His Holiness and the Italian princes require, and to reckon it



with that which we are bound to contribute, since this is a payment necessary for our salvation, and such a demonstration will tend to excite others, in imitation of us, to give greater sums, and since we have proposed this mode of contribution to [the cause of] our holy faith as pleasing to His Holiness, who has urged it on our orator.

Still our own wish would rather be to apply the said sum, within a certain period of time, to the endowment and erection of monasteries in our own dominions, or to the great Hospital at Milan, or to marriage [pensions] for young girls, or to other pious objects within our dominions, such as in the judgment of the holy theologians might suffice to induce His Holiness to grant us such remission [as we desire]. Of all this [information] your Paternity will make use with your accustomed prudence and wisdom, and according as it shall appear to you desirable. And as regards applying the said sum in our dominions, a sufficient inducement is that restitution should be made in the dominion where the wrongs were inflicted and the goods extorted, even though the persons [who were made to suffer] are unknown. But your Paternity will be able to see how to obtain this, if not altogether, at least in great part, or as you shall think better; and say to His Holiness that we offer ourselves to him as ready, if he deems it necessary, to accept for ourselves, and in our own person, every penance he deems advisable. We remit all this to His clemency and your discretion.

All the facts of this little history are now before us. We will not ask the superfluous question whether there is anything in them which points to a divorce between religion and morals in the minds of the parties concerned. We will rather ask if they do not witness to a striking alliance between religion and morals, alike in the good Duchess Bona, in the theologians whom she consulted, in the Pontiff to whom her application was made, and even in the sinful man for whose wickedness it was sought to atone. For, surely, what these two documents reveal to us, is the great moral efficacy of the Catholic religion, even as it was understood during that much abused century when we have been taught that faith had languished and almost expired. We see it in the heart of Galeazzo, as a powerful force struggling on behalf of the moral law with the fierce passions of his undisciplined nature, and at times obtaining the mastery; for it is evident from Bona's letter that, when he did repent, his repentance consisted in no mere outward recourse to the sacraments, but in an interior sorrow for the past and purpose of amendment and reparation, which, if unfortunately it was not lasting, was at least genuine at the time. And, in the Duchess Bona, we can estimate the moral efficacy of the religion of the

age when it found a congenial soil in which to take root ; what a delicate sense of obligation it could cultivate, what a self-sacrificing heroism in support thereof it could stimulate.

But it may perhaps be said : True, this one case breaks down. Still, the words of Cardinal Egidio (Canisio) remain—"Indulgences [as then preached] were an incentive to sin and a danger to souls." We have not been able to find where, and in what context, Cardinal Egidio used the language ascribed to him. If he was referring to the complexion put upon indulgences by certain of the questors, or itinerant preachers of indulgences, his estimate of their tendency is conspicuously true. But, in that case, he ought not to be cited as supporting the contention that "ecclesiastical authority" sanctioned the divorce between religion and morality which the misconduct of the questors was calculated to produce. Many of these questors were the charlatans of their age, not authorized in any way to proclaim indulgences, but as difficult to repress as modern charlatans are difficult to repress now. Others had authorization for their preaching, though by no means for the manner of their preaching ; they were acting fraudulently by the authorities who had commissioned them. That the authorities themselves were not responsible, at least not fully responsible, for the misconduct of their agents, real or pretended, is proved by the strenuous and persistent efforts made by Pope after Pope, and by Council after Council, General and Local—from the Fourth Lateran in 1215 down to Trent in 1546—to put a stop to the evil.

If, on the other hand, we are invited to characterize as an incentive to sin and a danger to souls, that mode of preaching indulgences which the Church herself sanctioned and endeavoured to carry out, we must ask where is the alleged evidence to be sought save in certain non-Catholic misconceptions. If we observe the Church's present action in the matter, we see that the gaining of indulgences—of jubilee indulgences most notably of all—has always proved an incentive not to sin, but to the renunciation of sin. Cardinal Wiseman's account of what he witnessed in Rome at the Jubilee of Leo XII. has often been transcribed :

I wish you could have seen not merely churches filled, but the public places and squares crowded, to hear the Word of God—for churches would not contain the audience ; I wish you could have seen the throng at every confessional, and the multitudes that pressed round

the altar of God, to partake of its heavenly gift ; I wish you could know the restitution of ill-gotten property which was made, the destruction of immoral and irreligious books which took place, the amendment of hardened sinners which date from that time ; and then you would understand why men and women undertook the toilsome pilgrimage, and judge whether it was indulgence in crime, and facility to commit sin, that is proffered and accepted in such an institution.

At Rome during this Jubilee the effect was seen on a large scale, but we are all (we Catholics) aware from our own experience in narrower spheres, that the working of the Indulgence system is rightly described by the Cardinal. And if these are the salutary fruits indulgences produce and are calculated to produce now, why are we to suppose they produced opposite fruits in the fifteenth century ? We are talking, be it remembered, not of the fruits consequent on the preaching of evil-minded questors, but of the fruits consequent on the authoritative preaching of indulgences. For, after all, the evil-minded among the questors were not the rule, but the exception, and the authoritative preaching was the same then as now. This can be proved by solid evidence, at least, in regard to the very instance which is most intimately connected with the outbreak of the Lutheran schism.

Whether Tetzel was innocent of the excesses with which Luther charged him may not be absolutely certain, but the tendency of modern research has been to acquit him. The charges rest mainly on the reports of persons like Luther, not particularly high-minded witnesses ; they seem to have been denied by Tetzel himself, certainly the more gross among them were, and they broke his heart and killed him within two years, whereas if he had been what they represent him to be, they would not have fallen on a nature so sensitive to their sting. We know, too, that his religious Superior said of him : " I do not know if another like him can be found who has done and suffered, and still suffers, so much and so often on behalf of the pre-eminence of the Holy See. . . . What an infinity of shameful and lying charges are manufactured against him and break him down, every corner of the street cries out."<sup>1</sup>

But apart from these gossiping charges against Tetzel, we have solid facts to show that in the intention of the Church the indulgence of Leo X. was intended to be preached, and was preached, exactly on the same lines, in all essentials,

<sup>1</sup> Apud H. Finann, p. 139.

as any modern jubilee indulgence.<sup>1</sup> We have the Bull itself of Leo X. granting the Indulgence; we have the instruction of Albrecht, Archbishop of Mayence, the Commissary appointed to superintend the publication in Germany; we have the further instruction drawn up by Tetzel, the Sub-Commissary for Saxony; and we have also several of the instruments delivered over to the individuals in return for their alms. In all these documents a good confession and communion are prescribed as essential to the gaining of the indulgence, and it is thereby made plain that the indulgence itself presupposed remission of *guilt*, through the penitent reception of the sacrament, and did not purport to communicate it. If in the same document, along with the remission of temporal punishment, there is granted leave to choose a confessor who will thereby be empowered to absolve (of course, *quoad culpam*), even from sins otherwise reserved to the Pope, and if the name of indulgence is given to the entire document—these circumstances in nowise alter the character of the remission of temporal punishment, or introduce demoralizing elements. And if in this conjunction of the two grants in a single instrument, any one should imagine himself to detect an ancient abuse, it would be well for him to observe that the two grants, the grant of a plenary indulgence, and the grant of special faculties for reserved cases, are likewise wont to be conjoined in a single instrument, in the Jubilee Bulls of the present day.

And now for the moral of the tale. Lord Halifax, or rather his informant (for it is presumable he received the account of Bona's application from some historical student), though with the best intentions, has mistaken the meaning of two documents, the language of which was somewhat technical. Any one might do that, if left to himself, when dealing with the technicalities of a system which he necessarily views from the outside, and in fact the treatises of non-Catholic writers on topics connected with Catholic doctrine and history are full of such misconceptions. Bishop Creighton, for instance, in his treatment

<sup>1</sup> In all essentials, for it is not an essential difference that in our times a summary is usually affixed to the church door, or published in a book or pastoral, indicating the extent of the indulgence and the conditions for gaining it, whereas in the fifteenth century it was usual to deliver such a summary to each individual on receipt of his alms. Still, though there is no essential difference, as far as the mode of gaining an indulgence is concerned, the ancient method lent itself more easily to the misconstruction of those who branded it as so much buying and selling. It was to obviate this misconstruction that the change was made.

of the Indulgence controversy between Luther and Tetzel, in his last volume, although manifestly trying his best to appreciate correctly the opposing arguments, misconceives and grows strangely perplexed over facts and phrases which to a Catholic are as plain as can be. If these misconceptions were without serious consequences, one might afford to pass them over with a smile. But, as the passage in the Bristol Address shows, they often give rise to the most serious charges against the Catholic Church, and thereby tend to nourish prejudices which are the greatest obstacles to Reunion. And yet it would be so easy to avoid them, if there were more of friendly personal interchange of views between Catholics and non-Catholics. This is a point to which we drew attention last month, in an article on the Pope's Letter. Is it too much to hope that in future some of our well-intentioned non-Catholic friends, before basing serious charges against our Church on inferences from our technical documents, will give us the opportunity of pointing out to them, if we can, any flaw in their arguments? They will not find us unfair or unfriendly, and we may save them many a misconception into which they would not wish to fall.

S. F. S.

## *The Religious Test Acts,*

CONSIDERED IN THEIR EFFECTS ON THE CHARACTER  
AND MORALITY OF THE ENGLISH NATION.

---

### PART II.

SIR WILLIAM SPELMAN has written a book called *The Fate of Sacrilege*. He has followed out in the history of great families the result of the possession of Church property. The fate of sacrilegious worship and mockery of holy rites in our middle and lower families cannot be written. If it could, how many souls and families there would be whose spiritual ruin might be summed up in the last words spoken by the second Baron Waldegrave of Chewton. Let me give the words from Dr. Oliver, who brings the authority of members of his household: "This nobleman [writes Oliver] abjured the religion of his forefathers about the year 1723, and in consequence was loaded with perishable honours and titles, of which death stripped him, 11th April, 1741, at Navestock, Essex. On his death-bed, alluding to his taking the oaths of supremacy and abjuration [and the declaration against Transubstantiation], he put his hand to his tongue, and, to the terror of the bystanders, made use of this exclamation: 'This bit of red rag has been my damnation.'"<sup>1</sup>

This "red rag" has been described by St. James as a world of iniquity. It was not enough for it to have been compelled to abjure the Vicar of Christ, not enough to have made it an instrument of what Catholics must call schismatical and heretical Communion, and what Protestants must admit to have been hypocrisy and sacrilege, it was henceforth, far into the present century, to wag in derision of Catholic doctrine and worship. We have now to consider how *blasphemy* was used as a Test, as an addition to, or substitute for, sacrilege.

I can trace this special form of impiety to the year 1643 and the Puritans of the Long Parliament, who had conceived

<sup>1</sup> Oliver's *Collections*, chap. viii.

vindictive enmity to Catholics because, in spite of their long persecutions, they as a body took the side of the King in the Civil War. These tender-souled Puritans on 15th February, 1643, issued an ordinance calling on the whole nation to imitate Ninive in repentance; but among the national crimes they enumerated very superfluously "a connivance and almost a toleration of the idolatry of Popery."<sup>1</sup> Then, in an abortive negotiation for peace with the King, the Parliamentary Commissioners at Oxford demanded, among other things: "That an oath may be established by Act of Parliament, wherein the Papists shall abjure and renounce the Pope's Supremacy, Transubstantiation, Purgatory, worshipping the Consecrated Host, crucifixes, and images; and the refusing such oath lawfully tendered shall be a sufficient conviction of recusancy. That your Majesty will graciously please to consent to a Bill for the education of Papists in the Protestant religion, and to another Bill for the better putting the laws in execution against them."<sup>2</sup> This was the Puritan notion of doing penance as a nation! Then, in order to carry on the war against the King, it was resolved to sequester two-thirds of the estates of Papists, both real and personal, and the following oath was to be tendered to all persons suspected of Papistry, being of the age of twenty-one:

"I, A.B., do abjure and renounce the Pope's Supremacy and authority over the Catholic Church in general, and over myself in particular. And I believe that there is not any Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the elements of bread and wine after consecration thereof by any person whatsoever. And I do also believe that there is not any Purgatory, or that the Consecrated Host, crucifixes, or images, ought to be worshipped; or that any worship is due to any of them. And I also believe, that salvation cannot be merited by works; and all doctrines in affirmation of the said points, I do abjure and renounce, without any equivocation, mental reservation, or secret evasion whatsoever, taking the words by me spoken according to the common meaning of them, So help me God."<sup>3</sup>

It must, however, be said that if this Test of blasphemous words was due to the diabolical ingenuity of the Roundheads instigated by the Westminster Assembly, it was well-improved

<sup>1</sup> Rushworth, v. 141.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* v. 165.

<sup>3</sup> *Commons' Journals*, August 17, 1643; Neal's *History of the Puritans*, ii. 198.



on by the Cavaliers and High Churchmen of the Restoration ; above all, it was extended, from an outrage on a few suspected Papists, to a general Test imposed upon the whole nation.

In the middle of last century Sir William Blackstone described the Corporation and Test Acts, made in the time of Charles II., as the two bulwarks of the Established Church ;<sup>1</sup> and it has been the custom to class these laws together. Yet they have very little in common, and from a Catholic point of view differ entirely in what I may call religious malice.

The *Corporation Act* was directed against Protestant Dissenters, and was the work of Lord Clarendon. Its date was 1661, the second year of Charles II.<sup>2</sup> By it no person could be elected to the office of mayor, alderman, recorder, bailiff, town clerk, common councilman, or other office concerning the government of cities, corporations, boroughs, or port-towns, who should not have taken the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper within one year before his election. The only penalty was that his election should be void.<sup>3</sup> There was no obligation by this Act to receive the Sacrament afresh, but of course those who had not fulfilled the condition could qualify before election if they chose to do so.

The *Test Act* was aimed at Catholics. It was passed in 1673. It had been pushed forward by Lord Arlington, to remove from himself the suspicion of Popery, to court popular favour, and especially to eject from office the Catholic Lord Clifford.<sup>4</sup> It applied to every person admitted to any office in the kingdom, civil or military, to every person who should receive any pay, by reason of any grant of His Majesty, or should have any command or trust.<sup>5</sup> It prescribed that every person admitted to such offices or pensions, should do two things. First, he should within three months (extended to six by 16th of George III.) receive the Sacrament in some public church, upon some Lord's day, immediately after Divine service

<sup>1</sup> Bk iv. ch. 4.

<sup>2</sup> In Parliamentary style the thirteenth.

<sup>3</sup> Even this was mitigated by 5 George I., which declared the elect irremovable unless a prosecution had been commenced within six months of election.

<sup>4</sup> Lingard, ch. 4, n. 4.

<sup>5</sup> If carried out strictly, the Test Act would have required Communion as well as renunciation of Transubstantiation from the monarch's pensioned mistresses. But it was full of inconsistencies. It had to be taken by non-commissioned officers in the army, but not by midshipmen in the navy ; by every petty tax-collector upon armorial bearings and window lights, but not by commissioners of land tax ; by keepers of lunatics, but not by governors of foundling hospitals.

and sermon. In the second place he should make and sign the following declaration: "I, A.B., do declare that I do believe, that there is not any Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the elements of bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever."<sup>1</sup>

The penalties of taking office without fulfilling these two conditions were dreadful. Instead of giving them to you in legal style, I will state them in the words of an orator who in 1787 introduced (unsuccessfully) into Parliament a Bill for the relief of Dissenters. His language is impassioned, yet strictly accurate.

"If [he says] the zeal of a Dissenter" (he might have said, or of a Catholic) "for the service of his country, should have induced him to bear arms in her defence, and to hazard his life in her cause, what return does she make to his patriotism? She strips him of every right which is dear to the man, or honourable to the citizen. For, if he is convicted of having fought her battles without the sacramental qualification, she tells him: 'Your property shall no longer be protected by the law, and the very privileges which arise from the private relations of life shall no longer be yours. Has your deceased brother appointed you by his will the guardian of his orphan child? that trust you shall not execute. Has a near relation bequeathed you a legacy? has your father left you an inheritance? that legacy, that inheritance you shall never enjoy. Even the property you at present possess shall no longer be secure; for, while to the claims of others upon you the courts of justice shall continue to be open, to your claims upon others they shall, from this time for ever, be inexorably shut. Thus beggared and stript of all, the vengeance of the law is not yet complete. The Test Act exacts from you a penalty which, even in a flourishing state of a soldier's fortune, might be thought excessive, and if that penalty is not paid, a prison is your lot.'"<sup>2</sup>

The penalty was £500, and as usual a large part of it was offered as a prize to the informer, and there was not, as in the case of the Corporation Act, a limit of time to liability. If the non-fulfilment of the Test was discovered thirty years after an appointment, the informer might sue for pains.

Such a law was found to be impracticable as regards the ever-increasing body of Nonconformists; and it was customary

<sup>1</sup> 25 Charles II. c. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Speech of Henry Beaufoy in the Commons, March 28, 1787.

to pass annual Bills of Indemnity.<sup>1</sup> Technically the Indemnity Acts applied to those only who had failed to qualify "from ignorance of the law, absence, and unavoidable accident," but they were understood covertly to include others. Thus it came about that the Test Act did not bear very hardly in practice upon Dissenters. The sword was suspended over their heads, but seldom allowed to fall. There is, however, a curious instance of its acting beyond what had been foreseen by the Legislature. In the eighteenth century the Corporation of London with much cunning chose for mayors, sheriffs, or other offices, dissenters of tender conscience who would not qualify, and then fined them heavily for non-acceptance of civic duties. The present Mansion House was built in great measure by these fines, and used to be known as the Palace of Intolerance.<sup>2</sup> As to Catholics, they were excluded from office by oaths as well as sacramental tests and heretical negations. No office was open to them without formal apostasy.

When I speak of office, do not think of high dignities, of a seat in the Privy Council or the Treasury. A sarcastic writer of the eighteenth century says: "The gradations are almost infinite between the Lord High Chancellor and the humble bug-destroyer to His Majesty. Yet both are included in the Act. May we not congratulate our country on its wonderful uniformity in religion, when not a bug can be destroyed within the purlicus of the Royal household, but by the hallowed fingers of a communicant."<sup>3</sup> Locke says that in his day men had to take the Sacrament, in order to obtain a licence to sell ale.<sup>4</sup> When it was proposed by the Commons to include in the Act the masters and governors of free hospitals and relieving institutions, a peer asked: What hurt can there come from Dissenting bread and cheese and Presbyterian water-gruel?<sup>5</sup> He might have urged: What hurt can come from a Popish tax-collector, or why should a keeper of a lunatic asylum renounce Transubstantiation, unless he would qualify for a lunatic?

What was the working of this Act? Church of England men and many Dissenters took the Sacrament and made the

<sup>1</sup> The first Indemnity Act was passed in 1727: and a similar one almost annually to 1828.

<sup>2</sup> See speech of Lord Holland, in debate on Test Acts, 1828; also Burn's *Ecclesiastical Law*, ii. 207—219.

<sup>3</sup> *The Rights of Protestant Dissenters*, p. 411, anno 1789.

<sup>4</sup> *Second Letter on Toleration*.

<sup>5</sup> *Chandler's Debates*, iii. 242; *Com. Journal*, xiv. 183.

abjuration without scruple ; some Dissenters, willing enough to renounce Catholic doctrine, who refused to receive Anglican communion, were excluded from office ; others took office without qualifying, and were saved from penalties by the Acts of Indemnity.

I do not assert that all members of the Church of England who took the Lord's Supper (as the law called it) on occasion of accepting office, committed a profanation in their conscience. A Catholic youth may go to the sacraments at the instigation of his parents, and perhaps would not go without that pressure. Yet he may have faith and conscience enough to make a good Confession and Communion. Of course if human respect or the wish to conceal an evil life was his sole motive, it would be otherwise. So may some (let us say many) Anglicans have received the Sacrament to qualify, yet received it devoutly, according to their lights. Mr. Evelyn was a moral and God-fearing Church of England man ; he writes in his diary, on April 26, 1673 : " Mr. Lamplough preached at St. Martin's, the holy Sacrament following, which I partook of upon obligation of the late Act . . . as being one of the Council of Plantation and Trade, taking then also the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, signing the clause in the said Act against Transubstantiation."

All, however, were not Evelyns. Strange stories are told of these qualifying. The Deistical writer, Anthony Collins, when appointed to the commission of the peace, is said to have sent a message to his clergyman : " Sir, I design to take a bit of bread and a cup of wine with you." Lord John Russell, in introducing his Bill in 1828 for the relief of Dissenters, said : " It used to be the custom in a church of London, for persons to be waiting in a neighbouring tavern, and not to enter the church till the service was concluded, when they entered for the purpose of what was termed qualifying for office. When this was the case, a person belonging to the church used to cry out, ' All gentlemen who come to be qualified will please to step up.' " (It may interest some of you to know that this church was St. Lawrence in the Jewry, near the Guildhall.)

I will not multiply instances of profanity. I have no delight in them. I loathe them. But I loathe also the Acts which by their natural working led directly to them. They acted to the degradation and ruin of the minister no less than of the laity. By the rubrics of his prayer-book the minister of the church

had to say: "All ye that do truly and earnestly repent of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbour, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in His holy ways, draw near with faith to take this holy Sacrament to your comfort." As minister of the law of England his words would have been more appropriate had he said: "All you that are lately appointed to offices under His Majesty, that do truly and earnestly desire your continuance therein, and are in love with the profits thereof—you that are lately become excise-officers, or custom-house officers, or salt-officers, or officers in the stamps, and have a charitable hope of enriching yourselves with the spirits of the illicit distillers, draw near in faith and take this holy sacrament to your comfort, that you may have a legal title to your places."<sup>1</sup>

It was the sight of these enormities that made the poet Cowper thus appeal to the conscience of England:

Hast thou by statute shoved from its design  
The Saviour's feast, His own blest bread and wine  
And made the symbols of atoning grace  
An office key, a picklock to a place,  
That infidels may prove their title good  
By an oath dipped in sacramental blood?

It was as if the Divine anathema was literally fulfilled: *Fiat mensa eorum coram ipsis in laqueum, et in retributiones, et in scandalum.*<sup>2</sup>

You may ask: Had not the minister power to refuse open and notorious evil-livers? Theoretically perhaps he had, if he would expose himself to a civil action. Lord Holland shows how this would have worked. He supposes a sharp, disputatious lawyer rejected because he is ever stirring up disputes and is not on speaking terms with half the parish. What, he inquires, would be the lawyer's answer? "You won't give me the Sacrament, Mr. Reverend, won't you? Very well, we'll see who'll gain at that game. We'll have you in Banco Regis in no time. I'll have swinging damages of you. You have spoilt my preferment, lost me my place, and you shall pay for it. I'll let fly my little *Per Quods* at you, and we shall soon see who'll smart for the costs."<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Beaufoy, in 1787, put a very different case: "Our fleet

<sup>1</sup> Speech of Mr. Henry Beaufoy.

<sup>2</sup> Psalm lxxviii. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Speech in Parliament, 1828.

is preparing to sail, the enemy's fleet is in the Channel; the officer appointed, as a man is of the highest professional merit, and is called to the command by the general voice of the people. Debauched, however, in his private life, living in avowed adultery and notoriously profane, he approaches the holy table. If the Sacrament be administered to him, in what situation is the clergyman? If it be refused him, in what situation is the kingdom?"

The last and worst phase of this dreadful national impiety remains to be noticed. The Test Act of 1673 excluded from place, but not from Parliament. During the madness of the Titus Oates' Plot it was determined to eject Catholics from both Houses. By the initiation and perseverance of the unprincipled Lord Shaftesbury—Dryden's Achitophel—a Bill was passed on November 30, 1678, that did this effectually. It was known as the Parliamentary Test Act. Every member of either House, before taking his seat, had to subscribe and audibly repeat the following declaration: "I (A.B.) do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.

"And that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous.

"And I do solemnly in the presence of God profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever; and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope, or any other authority or person whatsoever; or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever; or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or power whatsoever, shall dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 30 Charles II. s. 2, c. 1.



This Act continued in force until 1828, that is, exactly one hundred and fifty years.<sup>1</sup>

The reader of Virgil will doubtless remember how the Cyclops in their subterranean forge fabricated thunderbolts for Jupiter. They were hammered together of strange materials, rain, wind, and fire.

A load of pointless thunder now there lies  
Before their hands to ripen for the skies ;  
These darts for angry Jove they daily cast,  
Consumed on mortals with prodigious waste.  
Three rays of writhen rain, of fire three more,  
Of winged southern winds and cloudy store  
As many parts, the dreadful mixture frame ;  
And fears are added and avenging flame.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Craik has well said that this description of Jove's lightnings is curiously applicable to many Parliamentary thunderbolts, which are made up of "fire, flatulence, and fog."<sup>3</sup> Certainly no words could better describe the work of the legislators of the 30th of Charles II. The roundhead Cyclops had beaten the thing out in a rough state ; the cavalier Cyclops contributed a larger proportion of flatulence.

Whilst we have the last phrases of the Declaration still sounding in your ears, let me make a few remarks on them. Do not all these formulæ about evasions, equivocations, reservations, and dispensations, remind us of a brood of intertwining, writhing, and hissing serpents ? They were serpents, yet they struck with their fangs those only who put them thus together. Catholic gentlemen did not utter them, Protestants did ; and

<sup>1</sup> It must not be forgotten that these multiplied precautions against the prevarication of Papists were taken when Oates and Bedloe were falsely swearing away their lives, and statesmen *affected* to believe the evidence. "It was in vain," writes Lord Macaulay, "that, just before the cart passed from under their feet, they resolutely affirmed their innocence ; for the general opinion was that a good Papist considered all lies which were serviceable to his Church as not only excusable, but meritorious." Yet it would seem that they *did* believe that Catholics could be bound by an oath, provided it was skilfully worded ; and that they would not renounce their faith, nor receive a Protestant Sacrament. Bishop Hoadly, however, who wrote against the Test, has the insolence to say that "the Test is effectual and can be effectual only because the leaders of the Papists have not *yet* thought fit to give them a general dispensation," and this he calls an "accidental circumstance."

<sup>2</sup> Tres imbris torti radios, tres nubes aquosæ  
Addiderant, rutuli tres ignis et alitis auri.  
Fulgores nunc horricos, sonitumque, metumque,  
Miscebant operi, flammisque sequacibus iras.

(*Æneidos*, lib. viii. 429.)

<sup>3</sup> In Knight's *London*, n. xxx. (1).



for a hundred and fifty years no English peer or member of the House of Commons could take his seat unless he propped up his oaths of allegiance and supremacy not only with an insulting declaration against his own ancestors and the rest of Christendom, but with these ignominious, insane, and rotten phrases about having no dispensation from the Pope. Rotten, I say, for how could the multiplication of words bind a determined liar?

And is it not a curious and instructive commentary on the Pharisaic assumption of special straightforwardness—"the words just read to me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants"—that these very men went on for a hundred years, annually passing Acts of Indemnity of which the known purpose was to relieve Protestant Dissenters, yet which could only be twisted to that purpose by mental reservations of the wildest nature, such as were never dreamed of by the laxest of Catholic theologians. "Ignorance of the law, absence, and unavoidable accident," were the only pleas set up in these Acts of Indemnity for the non-qualifiers. "Ignorance" was interpreted as if it included full knowledge of the law and of its penalties; "absence" from the country was extended so as to include all who were at home, and "unavoidable accident" was all one with deliberate neglect.

Let me return to the Exclusion Act.

The formula having now reached its fullest development of insult and blasphemy, it was judged the fittest to be employed whenever a new repudiation was to be required from any class of citizens. When toleration was granted to Protestant Dissenters (by 1 Will. c. 18), a condition was made that in order to enjoy it every Dissenter should subscribe this latest form of declaration against Popery. Quakers were dispensed from taking oaths, but not from this declaration, and, to say the truth, they seem to have had no scruple about the matter.

By another statute of the 1st of William and Mary, the Lord Mayor of London, or Justices, might arrest any suspected Papist and tender to him the declaration against Transubstantiation, in the longer form. If he refused it, he must remove ten miles from London. The ingenuity of our legislators was really admirable. Papists not to stray five miles from their own houses! not to appear in the King's presence! not to reside within ten miles of London! Faithful Catholics had become the lepers of Protestant England. In Catholic England there had been restrictions on the movement of lepers; yet in the

leper-houses provision was made for giving to their inmates the Communion of the Lord's Body and Blood. In Protestant England the Catholic leper could be suddenly healed, and his bleeding flesh became again as that of a little child, if he could only be prevailed on to take the bread and wine of schism and swear a lie to his God.

Why, you may ask, should they single out Transubstantiation to be especially repudiated? It seems at first sight as grotesque as if the Jews had obliged every one to declare that our Divine Lord did *not* change water into wine at Cana, or did *not* walk on the Sea of Galilee. Even supposing that Transubstantiation was not true, yet what political aspect could it have? How could the belief in it make any one a bad citizen? Besides, Catholics were not punished for preaching Transubstantiation, but for believing it. The great Protestant Inquisition of England dragged it up from the secret of their hearts, and then cast it in their faces.

Yet the selection of this dogma, after all, was a right one. By an instinct as sure as that which makes the chickens take refuge under the hen's wings, have Catholics, in the days when truth was persecuted, drawn nearer and nearer to the Blessed Eucharist. And by an instinct as sure as that which guides the bloodhound to his prey, have the persecutors of Catholic truth directed their fiercest attacks against the Most Holy Mysteries.

I would earnestly ask modern Anglicans, who hold Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist, to note that the High Churchmen of the seventeenth century made no difficulty in joining with the lowest class of Puritans in negation, and that negation was the only thing they deemed important. So the Lutherans and Calvinists of France, in 1631, had agreed to merge their differences about the Real Presence in a common rejection of Transubstantiation, which caused Bossuet to say with great force: "What regards Jesus Christ is to them of small importance; what regards the bread and wine is alone essential!"<sup>1</sup>

This promptness of Anglicans to make a negative definition, combined with the reluctance of High Churchmen to say what they meant by Real Presence, did not escape the sarcasm of Dryden. The Church of England is thus apostrophized:

Dumb you were born indeed; but thinking long  
The Test, it seems, at last has loos'd your tongue.

<sup>1</sup> *Variations*, bk. xiv. n. 102.

And to explain what your forefathers meant  
By Real Presence in the Sacrament,  
After long fencing, pushed against a wall  
Your salvo comes, that "He's not there at all!"<sup>1</sup>

This definition or negation was, however, no self-defence, it was an attack. It was a studied insult to Catholics. Protestants had asked themselves, How can we best hurt their feelings? What do they most cherish? And they had answered: "Let us revile, and make them revile, the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. If we succeed, it will be rare sport, and there will be an end of their Popery for ever. But no, they had rather tear out their hearts than revile their Eucharist. Thus we shall surely detect them and cast them out." From this point of view the Test Act becomes nothing less than a national testimony to the faith and piety of English Catholics.

Under Shaftesbury's influence the outrage was carried a step further—the invocation of our Lady and the Saints was also declared idolatrous. If the purpose was to detect Catholics, this clause was superfluous; but if the intention was to insult Catholics, and to hurt their chivalry as Christian gentlemen, it was a cunning and—I will use a strong word—a *blackguard* device.

The full-blown formula was henceforth known as the Declaration against Popery (of 30 Charles II.); the shorter one as the Declaration against Transubstantiation. These were not Declarations reserved for proposal to suspected Papists only. The shorter form was exacted in the Royal household from every inmate,<sup>2</sup> from the maid of honour to the palace rat-catcher; and throughout the country from generals in the army to the ale-taster in a rotten borough. All had to repudiate Transubstantiation. Transubstantiation! Why, most of them could not spell the word correctly, and not one in ten thousand knew its true meaning. As regards the longer form, by which members of Parliament and many others assured the world "solemnly and in the presence of God," that the Sacrifice of the Mass and the invocation of the Virgin Mary and the Saints, were superstitious and idolatrous "as they are now used in the Church of Rome," what could the Squire Westerns and the Sir Roger de Coverleys know of the use of the Church of Rome? Yet I can recall but one or two instances of even momentary hesitation, on the part of these Protestant gentlemen of England,

<sup>1</sup> *Hind and Panther*, pt. ii.

<sup>2</sup> The Duke of York was expressly excepted.

at throwing this hateful accusation at the whole of Western Christendom, and implicitly at the Churches of the East. It was their ordinary preparation before making the Grand Tour of Europe.<sup>1</sup>

I have traced and recorded the history of these Declarations with as much calmness as I could command; but I confess that more than once some words of my old friend Kenelm Digby have come to my lips. After recording some platitudes of Bishop Hurd about chivalry, the author of the *Broad Stone of Honour* exclaims: "Oh, that it were lawful for once in our life to swear by a saint like a bad Christian, or by a dog like a sage, or by all the great or lesser gods like a foul heathen!"<sup>2</sup> It would certainly be an easement to mind and heart to make another kind of declaration, and to say straight out what one thinks and feels of the men who invented and who did these things. But I try to think that as a nation we repented of, or at least retracted and abolished, these enforced sacrileges and impieties. I fear, however, that no adequate national reparation has yet been made; and were I preaching a sermon I should insist on the duty, specially incumbent on English Catholics, to make the *amende honorable* to our Lord Jesus Christ and His Blessed Mother.

But to keep to my immediate subject, which is the clear and natural effects of the Test Laws on the nation. I will only add that the oath served to familiarize England with reckless swearing, which many persons consider to have been in the past, and to be at present, our great national vice. This I will not discuss, but I can say that as regards Catholics, rather than forswear themselves, the great majority chose poverty and ostracism from political life.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Evelyn, who had lived in Italy, felt some difficulty in calling Catholic worship idolatrous, though he had had none in rejecting Transubstantiation. "I went," he writes, November, 1678, "with Sir William Godolphin, a member of the Commons House, to the Bishop of Ely, Dr. Peter Gunning, to be resolved whether Masses were idolatry, as the Test expressed it, which was so worded that several good Protestants scrupled, and Sir William, though a learned man and excellent divine himself, had some doubts about it. The Bishop's opinion was that he might take it, though he wished it had been otherwise worded in the Test"—which I take to be a very fair specimen of Episcopalian casuistry, and of the principle: Do evi that good may come. Throw your oath on the State's conscience, and live like an Englishman. If there were Dissenters who looked on it as a grievance to have to insult Catholics and spit on their ordinances, they were silent on the subject. Not a single word of complaint have I found in innumerable pamphlets and Parliamentary debates.

<sup>2</sup> Morus, p. 264.

To sum up the matter. Few countries have been more devout to the Blessed Sacrament and to the Blessed Virgin than England; but no country has offered to our Divine Redeemer and His glorious Mother such deliberate and reiterated outrages. Mass has been proscribed and punished with fines and death; altar-stones have been broken and trodden under foot. An insular and schismatical rite has been set up in opposition to the worship of the Catholic world. That rite has been made a snare for the souls of Catholics, and has been degraded into a pick-lock for place for Protestants. A whole nation has been made for centuries to condemn they know not what, and to call idolaters they knew not whom. Emancipation came at last, but it was not so much the emancipation of Catholics from tyranny as the emancipation of Protestants from this hideous nightmare of sacrilege, perjury, and blasphemy. Is the Emancipation yet complete? Alas! no; for a law was passed in the 1st of William and Mary which is still in force. It was enacted that the King should, on the first day of meeting his first Parliament, sitting on his throne in the House of Peers, in the presence of Lords and Commons, or else at the Coronation, whichever should first happen, make the declaration against Transubstantiation and declare Catholic worship idolatrous. In the debates of 1828, Lord Eldon, who of course defended the Test Acts, made this appeal to consistency: "Why did their Lordships impose this Test upon the King, if they considered it improper to subject persons to it who filled inferior offices?"<sup>1</sup>

We have waited in vain for nearly seventy years for an answer to this question.

Alas! England, my country, my beloved country, is it necessary to the stability of thy empire that thy monarchs, the descendants of St. Edward, should thus insult the memory of their forefathers, trample on the most sacred feelings of millions of their own subjects, and affirm that of which they cannot possibly be assured? What statesman will deliver England from this dreadful incubus?

T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R.

<sup>1</sup> Debate of April 21.

### *Newfoundland's Treaty Obligations to France.*

---

DESPITE the intelligent attention freely given of late to Newfoundland on both sides the Atlantic, nowhere in Greater Britain have her treaty obligations to France, the prime cause of her wrongs, been more overlooked by contemporary writers than in the mother-land. And yet this anomalous international relation has been prolific of incidents in the decadence of the colony—a decadence which should have been arrested while yet in embryo; for, if once allowed to develop, no tinkering of treaties will then be able to bring about financial salvation, or rehabilitate down-trodden industries in Newfoundland. True it is that her recent financial trouble and strange political experiences have here alike come in for their full share of sympathy and criticism. The Colonial Office, the Governor, and the politicians in that “land of cods, dogs, and fogs,” have each in turn been held to bail for the course events have taken, which culminated in the crash of last December. And then we have had premature coquettings with Canada and dalliance with the States, spasmodically suggested by telegraph, if not through Reuter, then under the sign manual of Dalziel or that of “Our own Correspondent.” But the measure of blame for past ill-fortune that may be fairly assigned to treaty rights still wrongly conceded to France over the shores and waters of Newfoundland, no one here seems to be attempting to determine, although some may be impelled to follow the light that will be thrown thereon by Judge Prowse in his forthcoming history. Until its appearance, the French Shore Question will remain not fully understood of the people. Yet it is in the hope of rendering less obscure than they are at present the rights and claims in connection with it, and of making manifest the general mismanagement of the Colonial Office in its regard, that this brief sketch is written.

The treaties at present in force between England and France, governing the rights of the French in Newfoundland,



are the Treaty of Utrecht, 1713 (art. 3), the Treaty of Paris, 1763 (arts. 5, 6), the Treaty of Versailles, 1783 (arts. 4—6), a declaration of George III., dated September 3, 1783, in aid of the construction and intention of the former treaties, a similar declaration of the French King of the same date, the Treaty of Paris, 1814 (arts. 8, 13), and the Treaty of Paris, 1815 (art. 11). Their combined effect was to grant a license to the French, whose nearest possessions are the small islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, about one hundred miles south of Placentia Bay, to catch fish and to land and dry them on the shore between Cape Ray and Cape St. John. This coast line is seven hundred miles in extent, or about one half that of all Newfoundland. The French were prohibited from erecting buildings within these limits other than "stages made of boards and huts necessary and usual for the drying of fish," and from resorting to the island beyond the time necessary for the purposes of their fishing. British fishermen, it was also provided, should not interrupt by their competition the fisheries of the French upon that shore, and the latter were prohibited from wintering there. The above are the only material rights to which France is entitled under these treaties, though we shall presently see what claims she still advances in this connection. In order to appreciate the intention of the makers of these treaties, let us contrast the position of affairs in the colony at the time they were made with present conditions. During the whole period they cover, that is from 1713 to 1815, Newfoundland was nothing more than a fishing-station to which the fishermen of England and France alike annually resorted for the summer season. There was no settlement or colonization existing or contemplated, and permanent possession by the English fishermen was prohibited by Great Britain under severe penalties. No local government of any sort and no courts of justice then existed. Let us now look at the present state of the colony. In spite of this old repressive policy, a considerable industrial population has grown up at various points along the treaty coast. Its resources have been developed, and trade and commerce have advanced with startling rapidity. In addition, responsible Government was conceded in the year 1854. We can easily see, on a moment's consideration, how difficult it must be to give just effect to the words of treaties made under the circumstances indicated, so as to render such treaties reasonable under present altered conditions.



Let us now examine the claims of the French. The claims advanced by them and enforced by their war ships under cover of the treaties, may be shortly stated as a claim to the *exclusive* right of fishing on the seven hundred miles of coast from Cape St. John to Cape Ray, together with a claim to prevent occupation of the land on this coast to the extent of half a mile inland, for any industrial purpose whatever, on the ground that this, if allowed, might interfere with French fishing rights in the district. This claim to the *exclusive* right of fishing on the French shore is unfounded, and cannot be supported upon any grounds. The best writers on the history of the colony, treat the French right as merely concurrent with that of the British, and such, in fact, it is. All that the treaties have given the former is a mere license to fish within the prescribed limits, without interruption by the latter. The claim to the exclusive user of the coast is as devoid of foundation as is that to the exclusive right of fishing. The colony has protested, ever since the advancement of these claims, against the restrictions placed in consequence upon her user of her own shore, and the Home Government has at times admitted the validity of the protest. In July, 1838, Lord Palmerston, in a note to Count Sebastiani, disposed of the French claims to *exclusive* rights, and pointed out that they had solely arisen, as was the fact, from the practice of English naval commanders in these waters preventing the islanders from exercising their concurrent rights, in order to avoid possible disputes with French fishermen. The strong position taken up by Lord Palmerston, the Colonial Office, as is its wont, failed to maintain, considering the susceptibilities of the French to be of more importance than the just claims of Newfoundland. Lord Carnarvon, when Colonial Secretary in 1866, absolutely forbade the grant to colonists of land on the French shore. The Imperial Government was, in consequence, memorialized on the subject by the Colonial Legislature, both in the years 1867 and 1874, but to no purpose. Nor was it until the year 1881 that a tardy consent was wrung from the Home Government to the appointment of magistrates, to the grant of land and mining licenses, and to the setting up of custom-houses in that part of the island.

It is now some dozen years since the French claims assumed a serious aspect. Up to the year 1882, the French had carried on their fishing solely on the treaty coast, and that fishing had become increasingly unprofitable. They were, therefore, driven

to find some new field of enterprise. This they did by beginning to fish for cod on the Banks. With the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon for a base of operations, as long as they could procure fresh bait from the colonists, the French fishermen found themselves once more able to compete successfully with the islanders in the industry from which the latter derive their principal means of subsistence. But the French had, in addition, another advantage that Newfoundland had not. This consisted in the power which they exercised of imposing heavy duties upon all fish imported into France from foreign countries, in conjunction with that of giving large bounties upon all exported fish caught on the Banks by French vessels. Upon these terms, the colonial fishermen were unable to compete with the French, and the total ousting by degrees of British fish from the markets of Europe became only a question of time. To avert the consequent impending ruin, an Act called the Bait Act was passed by the Colonial Legislature in 1887, prohibiting the sale of fresh bait, which is essential to the prosecution of the Banks' fishery, to Frenchmen. To this Act the Imperial Government, under the influence of great pressure, and after having refused to sanction a similar Act passed in the preceding year, tardily assented. Its effect for a time was gratifying. The catch of fish by the French fell off, while that of the colonists correspondingly increased. But the prohibition of the sale of bait to the French entailed too serious a loss upon the many Newfoundlanders who had hitherto found a means of livelihood by supplying it to foreigners, and, moreover, the French soon found other, though less convenient, means of obtaining the requisite bait supply. The good effect of the Bait Act therefore not continuing, it was soon repealed, and matters reverted to their previous condition. Meanwhile, in response to the Bait Act, and smarting under the hindrance caused by it to their fishing operations on the Banks, the French had retaliated in the following manner. Notwithstanding that all they were entitled to under their treaties was to catch "wet" fish and to dry them on land, they started a claim to catch and can lobsters all along the French shore, and thus to compete with another important industry of the island, producing, in 1890, £100,000. This claim was advanced, not so much for the value of the trade itself, as to be an adjunct to the new industry of bait-catching for the supply of the fisheries on the Banks. The French, in furtherance of their new venture, forthwith established themselves along their

coast in permanent lobster factories, fitted with iron boilers and other machinery, instead of in the temporary huts and "stages made of boards" to which alone they were entitled under the treaties. Here again matters were soon brought to a head. The British naval officers on the station, at the instigation of the French and in order to avoid difficulties with them, arbitrarily put a stop to the setting of lobster trawls at various points along the French shore by the colonists. As a result, in 1887, a joint address was presented to the Queen by the Legislature on the subject. The address prayed that all buildings erected by French subjects upon Newfoundland territory should be removed as contrary to treaty, and that the interference of the French, under pretended treaty claims, with the rights of British subjects to the user of their land for lumbering, mining, agricultural, and other necessary purposes should be stopped. To this address Lord Knutsford, the then Colonial Secretary, replied that Her Majesty's Government were unable to meet the views of the memorialists. Thereupon Sir William Whiteway, the Premier of Newfoundland, was sent for to consult with the Government upon the whole matter. In the summer of 1890, in company with other delegates, he arrived in London, and had frequent interviews with the Colonial Office, and was also heard at the bar of the House of Lords in opposition to a drastic Bill which had been brought in by the Government for the regulation of affairs in the colony, with the view of preventing friction with the French. The chief result, however, of the visit of this deputation was that this Imperial Bill was dropped, and an undertaking given on behalf of the colony that a Bill for giving effect, among other things, to the strong colonial desire for the appointment of magistrates to act, instead of the naval commanders, as judges in disputes between the two nationalities on the French shore—the provisions of which had been previously approved by the Imperial Government—should be brought forward in the next Colonial Parliament. But though this was duly done, it did not pass owing to party jealousies.

Since the visit of this deputation matters have been allowed to drift, and no step has been taken to put an end to the continuing competition in the fishing industry. The *modus vivendi* which practically left things where they were, except with the addition of some fresh disadvantages for Newfoundland, come to in the spring of 1890, between the English and French Governments, has been renewed from year to year. In arriving

at this *modus vivendi* the island was allowed no voice, and its provisions have been carried out in defiance of her just rights and wishes. A final decision seems now no nearer than when the compromise was entered into. This present state of things is much to be regretted. No proper development of the colony's mining and other resources can be effected on account of these alleged rights. Railway communication with the western shore was for years rendered impossible, and projected lines, that would by now have been of immense service, had to be deferred or abandoned. It is only lately that the Imperial Government has sanctioned the making of a railway which is to run along part of the French coast and terminate at Port-aux-Basques, opposite the terminus of the Inter-Colonial Railway at Sydney in Cape Breton. Further, light railway extension is necessary for adequate development, and existing roads require improvement, while new ones too should be opened up. A loan guaranteed by the Imperial Government for such purposes as these, and for improving a few natural harbours on the French coast would, if proper arrangements were come to with the French, be of incalculable benefit. It can readily be understood how disastrous the French claim to the exclusive user of her coast to within half a mile of the shore has been to the colony, when it is remembered that the only practicable means of approach is by water. The effect of not actively resisting this has been to render useless in the past nearly half the island, as being land without a proper means of approach. But even though means of approach are now practically arranged with France, any rights on the part of a foreign Power must impede colonization and retard development, a thing at the present time, owing to commercial depression, especially to be deplored. It must not, however, be thought that the exercise by France of the rights which she has been permitted to assume under our loose interpretation of the treaties, has been an unmixed evil to Newfoundland. The supplying of French vessels, when they used to fish upon the coast, was a source of income to those living upon that shore, many of whom earned a precarious livelihood by ministering to the wants of the foreign sailors. But now that less than a dozen French vessels prosecute the old methods of coast fishing there, no compensating advantages result to the British resident population, which is always in a state of poverty, while the new competition on the Banks in the cod fishing, the staple

industry of the island, is very damaging to the well-being of the general population. Not only, therefore, in any satisfactory adjustment of existing relations should all French rights upon the shore between Cape Ray and Cape St. John be given up, but also that home of smugglers, the small islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, or, in the alternative, a binding agreement must be entered into between the two countries that nothing in the nature of bounties shall in future be granted by France, for the purpose of bolstering up her fisheries on the Banks of Newfoundland.

The Colonial Office has hitherto, in the matter of these French claims, been unable to adapt itself to modern requirements, and has neglected the best interests of the colony. Matters are still as unsettled as ever with the French Government. The rights of the French to fish on the coast have been of little or no value to them since they gave up prosecuting their coast fishery and took to that on the Banks, and yet no arbitration has been yet agreed upon between the two countries on the lobster question, or upon any other part of the matters in dispute. Litigation has already taken, and is likely to still further take place, between disturbed colonial lobster factory owners and the British naval commanders. Moreover, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of *Walker v. Baird*,<sup>1</sup> decided in 1892, expressly declared that the construction of the treaties and of the *modus vivendi* was a matter which could be inquired into by the Newfoundland courts. The friction thus set up is a cause of ill-feeling towards the Home Government which a due appreciation of its importance by the Colonial Office might prevent. The gravity of the existing financial situation is further intensified by the fact that the population is decreasing, and the best of the people emigrating to America, while half the island, rich in mineral and other resources, lies waiting in vain for development. The evils resulting from the cast iron methods of officialdom and the delay which accompanies its dealings with the colonies, cry aloud for cure just as loudly nowadays as when Sydney Smith defined the government of the colonies as being "commonly a series of blunders," or "a system of neglect." The present method of the so-called "protection" of the rights of colonists by British naval commanders is both cumbrous and ineffective. It involves, if complaint be made to the officer in command

<sup>1</sup> L. R. App. Cas. 1892, p. 491.

of any of the ships, that the particulars of the case must be reported to the senior officer on the station, by him to the admiral, by the admiral to the Admiralty, by the Admiralty to the Foreign Office, and by the Foreign Office to the British Ambassador at Paris, with instructions to place the matter before the French Government, the general result being that the cause of complaint is repudiated. The reply comes back by the same route reversed. If, on the other hand, complaint is made direct to the Governor, the process is slightly different, but quite as lengthy and circuitous as that by way of the war ship and the Admiralty. The case is forwarded by the Governor to the Colonial Office, thence to the Foreign Office, thence probably to the Admiralty to be referred to the naval officer for his report, thence back again through the Foreign Office to the British Ambassador in Paris, and from him to the French Government.

In all this Newfoundland is not fairly treated. The question from her point of view is not how the mother-land may best remain on friendly terms with France, in disregard of her colony's just demands for interference, but how the latter may obtain all the benefits to which she is entitled, even though they have to be rescued for her at the cost of trouble to the Colonial Office, and of perhaps some delicate negotiation with a touchy foreign Power. From Newfoundland's point of view the time has fully come for the existing tyranny to be over past. To France the value of the treaty rights is almost nil. All that impedes an arrangement satisfactory to both is the *amour propre* of the Gaul, refusing to be comforted by money for loss of territorial privileges now valueless. Is there no bit of Africa that may be freely given, and taken with honour, in full compensation for these rights to interfere, long standing though they may be, yet to interfere for no useful purpose, upon colonial territory? Is the finding of a way of escape from this continuing imbroglio too great a strain upon Downing Street diplomacy? Cannot the much needed bridge be built by its official hands? If not, our nineteenth century bureaucracy will have proved as great an anomaly as are these obsolete French treaty rights, which should no longer be permitted to exist to the grave hurt of England's oldest colony. It is the irritation caused by the want of consideration shown her by the Imperial Government, which has now driven Newfoundland, at heart an eminently loyal colony, into the arms of Canada. In a Reuter telegram of

212 *Newfoundland's Treaty Obligations to France.*

April 22nd, it is said that, if Newfoundland joins the Dominion, an attempt will be at once made by Canada to induce France to accept exclusive rights of fishing over forty miles of coast-line, in exchange for the existing concurrent rights upon seven hundred. This will be a move in the right direction, though one never attempted by England in the past, and is evidence of the vitality and sympathy existing in a great colony like Canada in a difficulty like that which has now been sufficiently outlined, as compared with the apathy and lack of interest in our dependencies which mark the Little Englanders that rule the roast at home to-day.

A. R. WHITEWAY.



## *Marriage after Divorce.*

---

IT would indeed be strange if disregard of the marriage-law of the Church, which brought about the Reformation in England, should also prove one of the causes of the return of many Englishmen to the centre of unity. More unlikely things have happened, and it certainly is a curious coincidence that the publication of our Holy Father's letter, urging the English people to return to the Faith, should have taken place simultaneously with an incident in a Protestant church turning upon marriage after divorce.

The persons most affected by the incident will be (1) those members of the Established Church who happen to hold the Catholic doctrine on the subject, and (2) those who hold a modification of that doctrine. There is a large class who care for none of these things, and amongst them, of course, the affair will pass unnoticed.

1. To those who maintain the Catholic doctrine, the painful incident must have shown the helplessness of their Church to uphold the truth, or even that part of it which was adopted by the "Lambeth Conference of all the Anglican Bishops of the world," when they solemnly condemned the marriage of the guilty party in a divorce action.

A marriage ceremony is taking place in a London church; the presiding minister is a clergyman of the Church of England, and he holds in his hand a proper licence to perform the ceremony. In the middle of the service, another clergyman, present in the congregation, protests against the marriage as contrary to the law of God. Whether this protest was regular or irregular, having regard to the fact that the marriage was by licence, and not by banns, is a question of little practical importance, since, if the objector had applied to the Chancellor of London, instead of protesting in church, the result would in the end have been the same; he would only have been told that his objection showed no impediment in the eye of the law,

being grounded solely on the facts that one of the parties had been divorced, and that his former partner was living. The protest was of no avail, the service proceeded, and the parties are now legally, if not morally, man and wife.

From the statement made by Chancellor Tristram in the Consistory Court of London on the 3rd of May last, it appears that nearly a quarter of a century ago the late Bishop of London lodged an order that no licence should issue for the remarriage of divorced persons. Dr. Tristram, however, was of opinion that the Bishop was acting *ultra vires*, and the order has been a dead letter ever since.

We sincerely sympathize with those High Churchmen who wish to uphold the Christian doctrine, and hope that many of them will trace the failure of their Church to assist them to its true cause, namely, the fact that the Church of England is a human invention, a house built, not on the Rock, but on the shifting sands of Acts of Parliament. The law of the land, by which that Church was brought into existence, and by which it is upheld, must of necessity be its ultimate guide in faith and morals.

The Divorce Act provides that when the time for appealing against a decree dissolving a marriage is past, or when the result of the appeal has been the confirmation of the decree for dissolution, "it shall be lawful for the respective parties to marry again, as if the prior marriage had been dissolved by death." This is certainly clear and uncompromizing.

The only proviso is that no particular clergyman is compellable to solemnize the marriage of a guilty divorcee; but by sect. 58 he is bound to allow any other minister in the diocese, willing to perform the ceremony, to use the church. Lord Halifax's Bill has been brought in to repeal this section, and, if it becomes law, a clergyman will not be compellable to lend his church, or to permit the proclamation of banns, where the guilty party to a divorce action wishes to be married, but in the case of the innocent party, no change in the law is contemplated. This will scarcely meet the wishes of those who abhor the whole law of divorce.

2. But there are others who will be satisfied with the proposed amendment.

In Roman law we are accustomed to the familiar figure of the *bonus paterfamilias*, the average Roman, who took average care in carrying out those contracts in which the law required

that amount of diligence. In the English law of rating, we make the acquaintance of the "hypothetical tenant," the imaginary person always supposed to be ready to give the proper rent for a house. On the 9th of May the *Times* introduced us to another hypothetical man, the representative of the class "large numbers of Churchmen." This "average Churchman," as we will call him, finds his feelings grievously outraged by the present law ; but holds that, though the guilty divorcee may not be remarried in a church, yet the innocent party is entitled to that privilege.

The first question which suggests itself is, What can the place or form of the ceremony have to do with it? If it is wrong for certain persons to be married in a church, it must be wrong for them to be married before the Registrar. With regard to the theory itself, viz., the distinction between the innocent and the guilty divorcee, it is difficult to see on what grounds it rests. Not on the law of the Church, for that has been certain and clear since the foundation of Christianity, that a consummated marriage cannot be set aside ; and that neither of the parties, whether innocent or guilty, can remarry during the lifetime of the other.

That this *was* the universal Christian doctrine no one (except perhaps Lord Grimthorpe) will deny. If the "average Churchman" asserts that it has been changed to suit the spirit of the times, the onus lies on him to show (1) when and how divorce of Christians became lawful, and (2) when and how the distinction between the innocent and the guilty divorcee came in. Private interpretation of certain portions of Scripture, and of the writings of the Fathers, is obviously an insufficient answer to the universal voice of Christianity.

Nor has the law of England given any countenance to this distinction, except so far as it has paid a certain regard to the religious scruples of some clergymen. The law says that so long as a valid marriage subsists the parties cannot marry again ; when the marriage is ended they can. A marriage may be ended (1) by death, or (2) by a decree absolute for dissolution, which is made equivalent to death. The decree ends the marriage (unless reversed on appeal), and it cannot be more at an end if one of the parties subsequently dies. The "average Churchman" would doubtless admit the right of the guilty party to marry if his or her former partner were dead, for then he would acknowledge that the former marriage was gone ; why

then should he deny the right when the marriage, from a legal point of view, is equally gone, having been dissolved by competent authority? It is evident, therefore, that his theory does not receive much more support from the law than from Christianity.

We fancy that compromise is dear to the heart of the "average Churchman," and probably our remarks will have but little influence on him ; but the incident at St. Mark's, North Audley Street, will no doubt help many others in the Church of England to see more clearly, on the one hand, the instability and uncertainty of a religion founded upon human opinion ; and, on the other, the firm and stable attitude of the Catholic Church, which, in spite of the various divorce laws from time to time introduced into different countries, proclaims now, as it has always done, the sanctity and indissolubility of Christian marriage ; that Church which, like its Divine Founder, is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."

WILLIAM C. MAUDE.

### *Spurious Records of Tudor Martyrs.*

---

RECENT letters from abroad brought to my notice what seemed at first new, interesting, and valuable sources for the study of the suppression of the monasteries in England, and for the history of the martyrdoms of their inmates. Investigation soon threw doubts upon their value. The results will be seen as we proceed.

The letters came in the form of a request to investigate the contents and the claims to authenticity of a set of extracts from historians of the Order of the Holy Trinity for the Redemption of Captives, and the subject treated of was the fall of their Order in England. The existence of such writings will be best and most briefly explained by a summary account of that famous Order.

The Friars for the Redemption of Captives were founded by St. John of Matha, in concert with St. Felix of Valois and Pope Innocent III., at the close of the twelfth century. St. John was thus the contemporary of Saints Francis and Dominic. While they addressed themselves to the most urgent spiritual needs of the day, he heroically sacrificed himself to the most arduous corporal work of mercy then needed—the rescue of Christians from slavery among the Moors. This good work was carried on with heroic zeal for many years. Englishmen sympathized warmly with it, and several joined the Order and are ranked among its apostles. Its third Minister-General was an Oxonian. Considerable sums, moreover, were contributed to the erection and foundation of monasteries for the friars, who were bound by their Rule to set aside one-third of their income for the redemption of Christian captives. As time went on, the power of the Moors declined, and so happily the main source of misery, which this Order aimed at reducing, gradually died away of itself. But there were many other unfortunates left in the world to be cared for, and we find the Order about the beginning of

the sixteenth century largely devoted to keeping hospitals and to other corporal works of mercy. Then came King Henry and his Ministers, Wolsey and Cromwell. Wolsey suppressed some Trinitarian houses and hospitals, and seized their goods for the endowment of his magnificent buildings at Oxford and Hampton Court, and Cromwell destroyed the rest. Since that time the Order has ceased to exist in this country, though a convent of Nuns of the Holy Trinity at Bromley, Kent, serves as a link to connect the present with the past.

In France and Spain the fortunes of the Order were much more prosperous. In the latter country they were always great favourites, owing, no doubt, to their good services towards the victims of Moorish invaders. The wave of the Catholic counter-reformation, which at the close of the sixteenth century was so powerfully felt in Spain, carried new life into the Order. A noble reform was commenced, and good works of all sorts were commenced with increased activity. Not least among these was an outbreak of literary enterprise. The history of their Order was diligently investigated, and a considerable number of books upon the subject were published.

The papers sent were extracts from these histories, and I think that the first sight of them would have caused any lover of the English Martyrs a start of pleasant surprise. It is so sad to reflect how many noble souls fought their good fight without a single friendly witness having testified to their valiant deeds. We know the lives of one or two, and a few details of the deaths of some others, but of the majority we know but the fact, the noble cause, the respected name. There must be hundreds more of whom we know not even this. It is therefore always a satisfaction to recover a new name, to bring to light the forgotten details of these glorious combats. The papers which now came under notice furnished many names and details hitherto unknown to our national martyrologies. True the chronicler seemed even more simple than usual at that day in his acceptance of the miraculous, yet certain easy identifications of names and dates, which suggested themselves as soon as one began to search, appeared to promise that further investigation might be attended with a rich harvest of historical discoveries.

But let the reader peruse for himself a translation of the first of the three stories thus sent :

Such was the haste of the Commissioners in their circuits of wickedness and tyranny, that two and sometimes three might meet together in a village, though on no preconceived plan. This did happen at Knaresborough. Leo had obtained information of the riches which were at the Convent of the Most Holy Trinity and in the chapel of St. Robert of Knaresborough, and which included not only offerings of gold and silver, but also rich stuffs and vestments, with embroidery of silver and precious stones. These he desired to seize for the King, and so to do him a special service. He set out, therefore, without delay, and arrived just as the Commissioner of Cromwell got there. But the two were no hindrance one to the other, for as soon as the Commissioner knew that Leo was there, he started for another place. Then Leo entered the convent, which was situated outside the town, and took the Religious by surprise. He went to the church, and entering into the chapel of St. Robert, he despoiled it all; this done, he went to the sacristy of the same chapel which stood apart from the convent and took all the vestments, and all the silver that was in it, and the gold and precious stones, and carried off even the chalices, amongst which were two very rich ones. Finally he departed, leaving the Religious greatly afflicted and weeping over his sacrilegious spoliation.

Next day he went to the chief church of Knaresborough, and commanded a heretic to mount the pulpit and preach. "What madness and folly it would be," said the heretic, "to allow the Convent of the Trinity to hoard such riches in a place where were only the bones of a dead man, who was perhaps an impostor. The Religious have deceived the people, and taken the money which was due to the poor and the service of the Church, to feed, clothe, and enrich themselves. As for the body of him whom they call St. Robert, it deserves to be burnt, and the Religious to be punished with the loss of their lives, as deceivers of the people." Leo presided with the authority of visitor, and when the sermon was over he said, "How long shall we let the deceivers live? That which he has preached is truth." Then many God-forsaken time-servers drew near, and offered themselves to execute whatsoever he should ordain, and so he returned to his house very well satisfied.

In the meantime the Religious who remained, bemoaning the robbery and spoliation that had taken place, betook themselves to the chapel to implore and entreat St. Robert to obtain for them fortitude from God and courage to suffer martyrdom for the truth, and the Catholic faith, and her holy law. Then they heard a voice which came from the tomb of the Saint, and which said, "To-morrow shall see us together in one place" (*Crastina die loco nos conjunget* [sic]). There was also in the convent a little bell, called St. Robert's bell, which rang the night before any of the Religious were going to die. It now began to ring, and they all expected their last night, for it rang so many times as taken in threes would correspond to the number of Religious in the convent, without exceeding or falling short by one ring.



Leo was determined to despoil the convent at all costs, so that night he took counsel with his friends and allies, what they should do with the friars. Most said, "There is only one thing to do. We must put them to death, and root out this rabble, which has deceived the whole country." Then he resolved that the day following he would put all to death, without excepting one.

The Minister of the convent was called Fray Roberto of Kendal, who, they say, was of the line of St. Robert, a most religious man, and most observant of his holy Rule. He exhorted his Religious, and offered to go first and confirm by example what he had spoken by word. Meanwhile there comes a large crowd of heretics and impious fellows. The leader approached, and the "prelado" goes out to meet him at the church door. The man asked, "Where is the Father Minister?" He answered: "I am he." In an instant a halter was thrown round his throat, and he was pulled to the ground and strangled. When the rest came up, they dragged him through the church and convent shouting to the Religious, "Repent, wretches, lest you suffer the same fate." "And we," answered the Religious, "should then be happy."

Then one of the intruders cried, "See, this is the way," and drawing his sword, he began to cut and stab the poor friars. Then the other heretics did the same, and so they despatched them all. Counting in their Superior, they numbered twenty-seven. The martyrdom of these Blessed Fathers was on the 13th of January in the year of our Lord 1535.

When the Religious were dead, they levelled with the ground the tomb of St. Robert, which was raised a certain height. They found the body incorrupt with its sinews and bones (for the flesh had distilled in drops, with which numberless sick were cured). They pulled it out like a skeleton for a demonstration in anatomy, and taking it to the town, paraded it through the streets with much derision and mockery. Then they dragged it into the fields, threw it with the other bodies of the Religious, and burnt them all together.

At night some Catholics came, collected the ashes, and buried them. Leo, who gloated over the spoil and robbery, had issued a prohibition forbidding any one to go to the place of burning, under pain of loss of goods and life. Moreover, he had stationed spies near it. But God was pleased to show His power and providence, and the Catholics were neither seen nor heard. And so no one came to harm, for the work of mercy and piety which they used towards the blessed Fathers.

Several details here seemed to indicate the reliability of the narrative. (1) Under the Spanish "Leo" it was not difficult to recognize the notorious Thomas Legh, to whom (2) was entrusted the visitation of so many Yorkshire monasteries. (3) It is true again that he did not go alone, and (4) that there was little concert between him and his fellow-commissioners

(5) The introduction of the preacher and the nature of his discourse are somewhat unlooked-for features, but quite in accordance with the practice of those times. (6) In placing the convent outside the town, he again hits the truth. (7) But the strongest corroboration of all seemed to lie in the date. It was exactly at that time when we know that Legh was very busy with his investigations round York. The coincidence is the more remarkable, as Legh was travelling at a great pace, and a fortnight later had completed the visitation (!) of Yorkshire, and had arrived in Durham.

Not displeased with this first taste of what our author offers, we pass to the next account given in our transcripts: it is the account of the suppression of the Priory or Monastery of "Motyndes," which, on inquiry, turns out to be that of Mottingden or Motynden, in Kent. Though no facts are given which can easily be turned to the verification or rejection of the narrative, we become painfully conscious of the credulity of the author in recounting the miraculous. This consciousness becomes even more acute when we peruse his account of the suppression of the Monastery of Hodestovve, under which title one recognizes with difficulty the name of Hounslow.

Puzzled by these first appearances, the next thing to be done is to betake oneself to the British Museum in search of fuller information. Here to our delight we find the very book from which the transcripts were made, which we have hitherto been studying. Its title is *Noticias historicas de las tres provincias del Orden de la S.S. Trinidad . . en Inglaterra, Escocia y Hybernia, &c.* Its author, Fray Domingo Lopez, describes himself as the chronicler of the Order, and he published his book at Madrid in 1714.

It was a pleasant sight to gaze upon. Over 600 folio pages about Great Britain before the Reformation, and all hitherto unused by English historians. The bibliographical Appendix was especially remarkable. From comparison with Tanner's *Bibliotheca Britannicæ et Hibernicæ* it was clear that it contained many details not to be found there or in Pitts. Not only so, but it seemed to be unknown even to Sir Duffus Hardy. It did indeed seem a treasure. There was a long chapter on the rise of the Order in England in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and still longer chapters on the labours and deaths of the valiant redeemers of captives, who in their perilous missions to the Moors had given their lives in their work.

Turning first to the account of the martyrdoms under Henry VIII., we go through the account of the London martyrdoms. The perusal opens our eyes beyond any possibility of doubt to the miracle-madness of the composer. Here is an outline of his story :

When, as the Carthusians were being led to death, the fatal procession passed the Convent of the Holy Trinity, the monks, led by Fray Ruperto Hildeston, the Minister, and Fray Rudolpho Vvildestovio, a Doctor of Divinity at Oxford, came out to encourage the sufferers, and were themselves animated at the sight of their courage. Returning to their chapter-house, they at the exhortations of Fray Rudolpho and Fray Ruperto, prepare for death, and distribute all their goods to the poor. Their conduct does not escape Cromwell, but he dissembles, and praises them for having exhorted the Carthusians to conform. The monks decline the honour and proclaim the Pope the head of the Church. Cromwell still dissembles and says he will excuse them with the King.

Next day, May 17, 1535, the cantor of the Martyrologium feels himself constrained by a Divine impulse to chant the names of all the community as martyrs, and over the seat of each in choir appear their respective pictures, each adorned with palm and laurel. Then Cromwell's emissaries appear, who straightway hang the Padre Minister and the Padre Doctor, and throw their bodies into a fire. The rest are consigned to prison, and despatched in the course of the next month. On the 19th, Fray Mauricio and Fray Edmundo, with two other ancient Religious, are drawn to the gallows and hanged. On the 21st, ten, amongst them Brothers Robert and George, are taken to the riverside, weights are tied round their necks and they are drowned. On the 30th, ten are burnt, and on the 3rd of June, five of the younger men are slung up by the shoulders and roasted at a slow fire ; more suffer the same death later. Of their names he records, Humbert, John, Reginald, and Henry.

The bodies that were burned remained entire and were afterwards found and buried by faithful Catholics. While the corpses of the martyrs were not consumed by the flames into which they were thrown, all who took part in burning them perished afterwards by fire. Some of the martyrs appeared after death, all finally received honourable burial from Catholics.

That so extraordinary an event should have taken place in the middle of London, and should not have been recorded by any of our chroniclers, is altogether incredible, even if the narrative were capable of being believed in itself. But the portentous nature of the marvels forbids any attempt to rationalize them. When we have rejected the alleged public

occurrences as non-existent, and what happened in private as unimaginable, we seem to have relegated the whole narrative to the world of dreams, and thither, if not to the province of fiction and forgery, we must banish the remainder of the history.<sup>1</sup> The following considerations easily demonstrate the spuriousness of the records of supposed English Martyrs, to which I propose for the present to confine my attention.

The number of convents of Trinitarians, as given by our author, is 44.<sup>2</sup> The truth is that they had about seven small convents, and a few still smaller dependencies. We may therefore at once dismiss six-sevenths of the 44 stories of their suppressions, and the blood-curdling particulars of the murder of their inmates, for graphic reports of all these are set before us. Not only are the numbers of convents multiplied, but their magnitude is grossly exaggerated. At Oxford the whole community amounts to 87, at Ingham to 85, at Motynden to 79,<sup>3</sup> and so forth. If this were true, they would have equalled or even exceeded some of the greatest Benedictine abbeys in the land. In truth the Trinitarian houses were both small and poor. "The total revenues of the seven houses of Trinitarian Friars (which are all we have the valuation of) amounted to £287 7s. 5d. per annum."<sup>4</sup> According to this reckoning the Trinitarian convents were so far from approaching any of the greater abbeys, that the seven put together would have been equal only to about one-seventh part of one of the great Benedictine foundations of Canterbury, York, or Glastonbury.

<sup>1</sup> The same verdict was arrived at by two writers in the *Dublin Review* in 1865 and 1875. (New Series, iv. 386, and xv. 299.) They chiefly discuss the Irish history, and had not the advantage of consulting the Trinitarian literature now in the British Museum, to which reference will be made below.

<sup>2</sup> They are according to him the following (p. 38), (I give the English where recognizable): St. Asaph, Bangor, Bath, Binconiensis (*sic*), Bristol, Bury, Cambridge, Canterbury, Capurcensis (*sic*), Carlisle, Chester, Clarensis (*sic*), Dariensis (*sic*), Durham, Eboracensis (York), Ely, Exeter, *Hereford*, Hovdestouwe, *Howunslow*, Huntingdon, Icogne (*sic*), *Ingham*, *Knaresborough*, Lancaster, Llandaff, Leicester, Leuniensis (*sic*), Limmensis (*sic*), Lincoln, London, Menevia, *Motynden*, Northampton, Norwich, *Oxford*, Peterborough, Rochester, Salisbury, Stanford, Telloforud (? Thelford), Wallensis (Wells), Winchester, *Worcester*. The spelling varies in different places. He also mentions Reigate, Guilford, Golver (*sic*), and Howense (*sic*).

The names in italics certainly correspond with real Trinitarian houses, cells, or convents. He does not recognize Totnes in Devon; Donnington in Berks; Eston in Wilts; Berwick and Walknoll in Northumberland, where the Order had small settlements.

<sup>3</sup> So Figueras, though Lopez reduces them to 47.

<sup>4</sup> Tanner, *Notitia Monastica*, Introduction, sig. o

A clear indication of the fictitious nature of our writer's details, is afforded by the frequent introduction of University scholars. Thus in almost every convent we find some person of remarkable learning, which has generally been crowned by a degree of Doctor of Theology at Oxford or at Cambridge. Now the Registers of the University of Oxford have been of late carefully published and indexed, and the writers of Cambridge have also been accurately chronicled. Yet *not one* of the thirteen alleged doctors and writers can be traced in either.

Next let us consider his account of the Convent of Ingham. Ingham was once a centre of the Order in England, insomuch that the Religious in this country were sometimes called *Inghamites*. This was known to Lopez, and we accordingly read in his pages a proportionately wonderful account of its suppression, with plenty of details. He gives us the names of Cromwell's commissioner, of the Father Prior (Minister), and of the Oxford D.D. He adds particulars of the vision seen by the holy Fray Gerardo de la Cruz, and fixes a date, March 27, 1535, or 1534,<sup>1</sup> "according to other authors."

We are able in the case of this monastery to check our writer's statements by contemporary records, and the process is instructive. Lopez gives the number of the whole community as 85. Tanner<sup>2</sup> tells us that the convent was *only founded for eight*, but that the number was to be *raised to thirteen*, when their funds were able to support them. In point of fact there was a Prior with *only six monks* at the time of the suppression. We have their names too, and on comparing them with those given by Lopez, we find them altogether different. *Not even one Christian name is right*. We know, moreover, the name of Cromwell's four commissioners appointed to receive its surrender. The one name which Lopez gives bears no likeness to any of them. Lopez tells us that the community were slaughtered to a man for refusing the oath of supremacy. The chief document we

<sup>1</sup> This variation in the year looks suspiciously like an attempt on the part of its author to imitate the results of the *old style* of dating in England. Years were then commenced not from our Lord's Birth in December, but from His Incarnation in March. Consequently the dates between December and March were given by writers abroad who followed the *new style*, with a double year number, both the old and the new. If in the present instance our author wishes to imitate this double year number, he has made a gross blunder. Double numbers stop on March the 25th. March 27, 1534-5, is therefore an intrinsic absurdity.

<sup>2</sup> *Notitia Monastica*, sub voc. p. 367.

have used to confute his statements is an abject acceptance of the supremacy signed by the Prior and all his monks, which is still extant under their own hands in the Record Office.<sup>1</sup> Another document in the same place, dated eighteen months after the supposed massacre, shows us that the convent was not only still standing, but in hopes of continuance.<sup>2</sup>

It is perhaps unnecessary here to push destructive criticism further, to note the un-English nature of legends, and their dissimilarity from the usual course of the persecution in this country, or to remark on the absurdity, that while every inmate of every convent is supposed to be slaughtered, some one survives in each case to record all the particulars of the event. But something must be said of the preposterous object which our writer deliberately sets before himself.

His declared theme from first to last is to prove that of *the whole Order*, which he seems to estimate at not less than three or four hundred, *all* died martyrs, without a single one having wavered for a moment in his profession of faith. Any one who knows human nature will perceive how extravagant the idea is. Any one who has read the story of the suppression of English monasticism, will feel how sadly it contrasts with the truth. Taking English churchmen in King Henry's time, as a body, they made but a sorry show in their resistance to the oppressor. Betrayed by their leaders, swept along by an unparalleled popular opinion in favour of abject subservience, with their beautiful churches, their holy things, their lives in the tyrant's hand, what wonder if Chauncey compared one of the noblest Martyrs of his day to Rachel weeping and refusing to be comforted. A quiet noble heroism was not wanting. There were not a few who would submit even to death, rather than conform to the laws of an impious persecutor. But how different is this from the ideal of Lopez. He draws his characters after the manner of spiritual swash-bucklers, equally ardent in parading their orthodoxy, abusing their enemies, and tempting their fate.

<sup>1</sup> See Seventh Rep. of Dep. Keeper, p. 289.

<sup>2</sup> Calendar S.P., August 16, 1536. They claim exemption from the law because they are neither canons nor monks, but crutched (crossed) friars. This plea shows, by the way, how easy it is to confuse these terms together. In the *Dublin Review*, April, 1894, p. 274, Father Gasquet published a paper in which the Trinitarians of Eston describe themselves as "crosse chanons of Saint Augustyne's rule." In Cardinal Pole's Pension Book (Q. R. *Miscell. Books*, 34), the surviving Trinitarians are described as having belonged to *monasteries*. This unanswerable proof of their survival affords a fresh proof of the spuriousness of these pretended martyrdoms.



*Inimicus homo hoc fecit.* It was not inspired by a heart in love with truth, or in sympathy with the sufferings of the monks, but by some busy brain or crafty wit that desired to flatter those from whom it expected temporal favour and promotion. Who the guilty party or parties were I do not pretend to say. It seems probable that, without much searching in Spanish archives, there would be little chance of discovering the culprits. I am far from accusing the Fray Domingo Lopez, who has enrolled these fables at such length in his book, of having originated them in his brain, for they existed in some form or other a century before he began to write. A short account of the earlier writers on this subject will convey the best suggestion I am able to offer as to the origin of these stories, and may be of assistance to those who wish to prosecute further inquiries.

Previous to any printed record of the extravagancies we have been discussing, a brief, moderate, and not incredible account of the same events was written by Bernardinus a S. Antonio, in his *Epitome Generalium Redemptionis*, an octavo volume published at Lisbon in 1625. His account is that there were seven monasteries at the time of the suppression in our province of the Order, and one of these was in Ireland. They were entirely destroyed at the Reformation, and the Religious, *to the number of about one hundred*, were *either killed or exiled*. He only gives the names of three martyrs.

In subsequent writers this simple story undergoes development in three different directions. First, the principle is advanced that the Order had *none but martyrs*. This principle was asserted as early as 1630 by Gil Gonzales<sup>1</sup>, and henceforth was accepted as a firm foundation on which much that was wonderful might be safely erected. The other two principles in constructing the history were first to multiply the number of monasteries, and consequently also that of the martyrs, and then to introduce plenty of gruesome detail. These appear in force in the pages of Gil Gonzales, who doubles the number of monasteries, though he seems to have divided his martyrs according to the original number of seven convents. He also alludes to a great variety

<sup>1</sup> Gil Gonzales de Avila, *Compendio Historico*, &c. Madrid, 1830. British Museum, 4826, bb. Figueras, *Chronicum Ordinis SS. Trinitatis*, Verona, 1645, is much quoted, but is not in the Museum. P. Lopez de Altuna, *Cronica General*, &c., may, however, be found there (483, d. 18), and contains an account which is at least free from many subsequent interpolations.



of deaths by violence. The earliest authority quoted as combining all these principles is one who is referred to as "Don Felipe Ovsullevan Bearro."<sup>1</sup> O'Sullivan recounts stories of horrible hecatombs of Trinitarian martyrs, but, as far as I see at the pages indicated, in Ireland only. These he relates on an authority which he declares irrefragable—that of Father Goold, a Limerick Trinitarian, who had heard them when a boy from a very old man. He adds that papers on the same subject were *said* to be preserved at Paris.

We have now traced back, not indeed to their sources, but as far as we can, the different elements of which this fabulous history seems to be made up. Lopez did not invent them, and perhaps the story had been worked up into its fulness before he wrote it down. Whatever our suspicions may be, conclusive evidence against him is wanting, and he must be left the benefit of the doubt. Perhaps my readers will think they do him a greater benefit by crediting him or his predecessors with a fine fancy and boldness in reconstructing the past, than they would by believing him childishly silly in stringing together hearsay marvels. That is a subtle point which I will not attempt to discuss. Our story-teller, whoever he was, can at least be cleared of a malicious desire to injure others by his inventions. It is that motive which makes the religious forgeries of those days especially heinous, for it was indeed an age of forgeries, the age which accepted the *Monita Secreta Societatis Jesu*, and so many fictitious "Memoirs." Spain was by no means free from the taint. In England, Robert Ware's *Hunting the Romish Fox*, which Father Bridgett has so admirably exposed in his *Facts and Forgeries*, *The Memoirs of Father Walpole*, and Robert of Circencester's *De Situ Britannico*, may be named as samples of a class of literature which was widely spread.

It seems to me, however, that the fraud under consideration may have grown out of a practice, which the public so easily condones in the expansion of telegrams. We have had many exposures of this lately. A paper gets a few words telegraphed from Japan or Australia, an ingenious newsagent in London adds circumstances usual in battles or cricket matches, "corroborative detail," as Mr. Gilbert would say, "to lend authority to a bald and otherwise unconvincing narrative." The completed report appears next morning—"from our own correspondent."

<sup>1</sup> *Patritiana Decas*, &c. Madrid, 1630. Brit. Mus. 486, b. 25.

Similarly Lopez, or his predecessors, or all of them, in expanding each other's stories, *may* have evolved these fables, without any one of them intending to write fiction.

But however kindly an interpretation of their *modus operandi* we may adopt, the fact remains that we are in the presence of an extensive falsehood. The writers who lend it their authority must for ever be held in dishonour, all the deeper because of the sacred subject they have contaminated. They have practically frustrated the object they sought to attain, for it is hardly possible now that their Order will ever gain the least glory even from the real sufferings of its faithful sons, which they have obscured with their deceptions. Their extravagances or their obscurity have hindered their attracting the attention of English writers, and we may be thankful that they have been prevented from compromising, as they tried to do, the cause of Catholic truth. English Catholic writers have been accused of being cowed by persecution, and of pushing moderation to minimizing. When we see the sad results of this attempt at self-laudation, we may be thankful that our writers err, if at all, on the other side.

J. H. POLLEN.

## *An Old Picture.*

---

THE great solemnity of the Dedication of England to the Blessed Virgin Mary which took place two years ago in the Church of the Oratory, London, in presence of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, the English Episcopate, and a vast gathering of representative Catholics, has given a new interest to the old painting representing the original Dedication six hundred years ago, of which the ceremony of June 29, 1893, was but the formal confirmation. I say "confirmation" rather than "renewal," for the original donation of England to Mary was both personal and territorial, and therefore irrevocable. Her liegemen have for the most part, no doubt, rebelled against their Suzerain; Englishmen have played the traitor and have reviled and blasphemed the sweet name of their Sovereign Lady; nevertheless, as Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, expressed it in the first year of the fifteenth century, Englishmen have by a formal, official, and authoritative act been made for ever "humble servants of Mary's own inheritance and liegemen of her especial dower, as we are approved by common parlance;" and as long as England is England, so long the country is and must remain in the truest and fullest sense of the word the Dower of Mary.<sup>1</sup>

As is well known, there formerly existed in the English College of St. Thomas of Canterbury in Rome an ancient picture which exhibited a young King and Queen in the act of presenting England to our Lady for her Dower, with the words:

Dos tua, Virgo pia  
Hæc est; quare rege, Maria:

It may be rudely translated thus:

Thy Dowry 'tis, O Virgin boon;  
Wherefore rule it for thine own.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Waterton, *Pietas Mariana Britannica*, p. 16, where he proves the assertion in the text.

Who were they, this King and Queen? That is a question which has long exercised antiquarians, and in the present state of Catholic feeling has, it may be hoped, an interest for a yet wider circle than mere antiquarians. Different writers have attempted to identify the royal couple with different English sovereigns. Mr. Waterton has learnedly advocated the claims of Richard II., and Father Bridgett has gone far to prove the truth of Waterton's contention. My excuse for reopening the subject is that after studying the question with care, I am now, as I believe, in possession of evidence that proves to demonstration the conclusion already rendered most probable by the careful researches of the scholars just mentioned.

Who were this King and Queen? Father Adrian Van Lyere, S.J., or, as it is Latinized, Lyraeus,<sup>1</sup> tells us that one of the Edwards presented England to our Lady for her Dowry. Unfortunately he quotes no authority for this assertion. But, what is more to our purpose, he adds that this donation was confirmed by Richard II., as may be seen from "a very ancient picture in the English College in Rome, with the dedicatory inscription, *Dos tua,*" &c.

Again, it has been conjectured that the monarch in question is Henry V., the hero of Agincourt. Thomas of Elmham—in his metrical, or as he himself calls it, proso-poetical, History of Henry V.—again and again speaks of England as the Dowry of Mary; but in the concluding lines of chapter x., in which he is trying to prove that the crown of France has belonged to England since the time of Edward II. by virtue of his wife, he obviously had in mind the inscription on our picture. His words are:

*Anglia dos tua fit; pia mater, Virgo Maria,  
Henrico rege, tu tua jura rege.*

However, as Father Bridgett<sup>2</sup> points out, Henry V. cannot possibly have made the original donation at least. At most he only renewed a consecration already made before his time, since this same Thomas of Elmham<sup>3</sup> records that at Agincourt, in 1415, the English rushed to battle with the cry, "Mary for her Dowry,"<sup>4</sup> so that England was popularly known by this title in the second year of Henry's reign. Nay, so far back as the first year of Henry IV., so universally was England

<sup>1</sup> *Trisagium Marianum*, Antwerp, 1648, p. 324. Quoted by Waterton.

<sup>2</sup> *England for Our Lady*, p. 17. <sup>3</sup> Ch. 37.

<sup>4</sup> "Virgo Maria, fave! propria pro dote."

recognized as the Dowry of Mary, that in a public document, dated February 10, 1400, Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, referred to it as a notorious fact. He writes: "The contemplation of the great mystery of the Incarnation has brought all Christian nations to venerate her from whom came the beginnings of redemption. But we as the humble servants of her own inheritance and liegemen of her especial dower, as we are approved by common parlance, ought to excel all others in the fervour of our praises and devotions to her."<sup>1</sup>

So far, then, the argument makes most strongly for Richard II. as the original donor of England to our Lady. For it cannot, on the one hand, be shown on trustworthy grounds that Mary had been constituted the liege Lady of England prior to Richard's day; and, on the other hand, it can be proved that the endowment had been made before the first year of Richard's immediate successor. But if this conjecture be correct, on what occasion, it may be asked, and from what motive did Richard make over his kingdom as the Dowry of Mary? To this question the general answer might be given that it is unnecessary to specify any particular occasion or special motive, as such an act on the part of a young, ardent, and devout sovereign would be in perfect keeping with the deep spirit of piety manifested by his ancestors towards the Mother of God. For devotion to our Lady was no new thing in England in the fourteenth century. It flourished with a strong and vigorous growth not only among the Norman conquerors, but also among our earlier Saxon forefathers. Father Michael Alford, S.J.,<sup>2</sup> traces back British devotion to the Queen of Heaven even to the primitive ages. However, to the question as to the time and motive that led Richard II. to take this step, Father Bridgett<sup>3</sup> has supplied a more specific, satisfactory, and gratifying answer. He writes:

Who does not remember to have read with horror of that dreadful 14th of June, 1381, when the infuriated rabble, under the cruel and ambitious Wat Tyler and the profligate priest who called himself Jack Straw, after wholesale massacres and reckless destruction of property

<sup>1</sup> Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 246. I quote from Waterton, p. 14. This mandate is not to be found in Spelman.

<sup>2</sup> *Fides Regia Britannica*, vol. i. p. 57. Liege, 1613. His real name was Griffiths. I must, however, confess that his piety is more striking than his argumentation.

<sup>3</sup> *England for our Lady*, p. 19.

in London, rushed into the Tower, dragged the Archbishop of Canterbury, Simon of Sudbury, from the altar where he had just celebrated Mass, and having murdered him, nailed derisively an ecclesiastical cap to the venerable head, which they fixed upon London Bridge? What followed on the next day, and how Tyler was cut down by the Lord Mayor at Smithfield, is also well remembered and is commemorated by the statue of Sir William Walworth on Holborn Viaduct. The young King's intrepidity on this occasion has won the praise of our historians; but the details of the piety which inspired this courage have been too generally passed over in silence by modern writers, whether Protestant or Catholic.

Froissart did not consider them so unimportant. He tells us that after the short repose of that terrible night, when the King awoke, knowing that his kingdom and even his life were in danger, he rode to Westminster, where with the nobles who had gathered around him, and the Lord Mayor, William Walworth, he heard Mass in St. Stephen's chapel and ardently implored God's help. Thence they went to kneel before an image of our Lady, called "Our Lady of the Pew,"<sup>1</sup> or of the royal gallery. "This image," says Froissart, "is famous for miracles and graces, and the Kings of England place great trust in it. The King then made his prayers before this image, and *made an offering of himself to our Lady*. Then he mounted on horseback and all his nobles with him and rode towards London." He could not but attribute to those prayers and to this offering the marvellous turn of fortune that immediately followed.

A year<sup>2</sup> after this deliverance from peril, Richard was united in marriage with the "good Queen Anne." What is more natural than that, having offered himself to our Lady in so critical a moment, and having experienced her power and goodness, he should have made in gratitude a public and solemn offering of himself and of his kingdom to his glorious Protectress?

This ingenious conjecture seems to tally with all the facts of the case. Towards the end of 1380 the Earl of Kent had gone over to Flanders to arrange for the King of England's marriage to Anne of Bohemia, the sister of the Emperor Wenceslaus, and it had been decided to receive the bride in England before Michaelmas, 1381.<sup>3</sup> But in June of that year Wat Tyler's rebellion had compelled a postponement of the marriage. In point of fact Anne did not arrive in England until December 18th, and on the 13th of that month a general

<sup>1</sup> For a learned and most interesting discussion of this word "Pew," as here used, read Waterton, bk. ii. pp. 227 fol.

<sup>2</sup> It was less than a year since Wat Tyler was cut down in June, 1381, and Richard was married to Anne on January 14, 1382.

<sup>3</sup> Rymer, vii. 302, seq. 1816.

pardon had been issued to the rebels at her intercession. What more likely than that in his offering of himself to our Lady, Richard, then an ardent youth of seventeen, should associate with himself the young wife he loved so dearly, union with whom our Lady's help had rendered possible, and whose intercession for the rebels had brought to a happy termination the Commons' menacing attack on his throne and life?

To the picture itself we cannot appeal for information, since it has disappeared. The latest notice of it with which I am acquainted is that of Father Alford,<sup>1</sup> who in 1663 wrote as follows: "There is at Rome in the English College a portrait of two kings, that is to say, a very ancient picture in which a king and queen, in a kneeling posture, are offering through St. John the island of Britain to the Mother of God, with the inscription, *Dos tua*," &c.

There is an earlier notice of the same picture in a most interesting manuscript in the British Museum,<sup>2</sup> which Father Bridgett has printed in the Preface to the third edition of *Our Lady's Dowry*. The MS. in question was written early in the reign of James I., is of a violent and anti-Catholic nature, and contains what appears to be a verbatim transcript of a broadside or leaflet then or shortly before in circulation among Catholics. A marginal note says, "verbatim as it is in the written copie taken in a searche." It runs as follows:

That England is Our Lady's Dowrie. In the Church of St. Thomas Hospitall in Rome there is a very faire painted and gilded Table of Imagerie worke, standing before the Altare of Saint Edmund the martire, once a King of England; which by the viewe of the wood and workmanship seemeth to have bin painted about an hundred yeares past. It is in length about five foote, and about three foote high. It is divided into five panes. In the middle pane there is a picture of our blessed Ladie. In the nexte pane upon her left hand kneeleth a young King, Saint Edmund as it is thought, in a side robe of scarlet, who, lifting his eyes and handes towards our blessed Lady and holding betweene his hands the globe or paterne of England, presenteth the same to our Ladie saying thus: *Dos tua Virgo pia hæc est; quare rege, Maria*—"O blessed Virgin heere beholde this is thy Dowerie. Defend it now, preserve it still in all prosperitie." His scepter and his crowne lying before him on a cushion and St. George in armour standing behind him in the same pane, somewhat leaning forward and laying

<sup>1</sup> P. 57.

<sup>2</sup> Harleian, n. 360, fol. 98 b.



his right hand in such manner upon the King's back that he seemeth to present the King and his presents to our blessed Ladye. This may induce a man to think that it is no newe devised speeche to call England our Ladyes dowerie.

As to the date of the older document transcribed verbatim in this MS., it must have been written before 1580. For the English College was founded in 1578, and St. Thomas' Hospita or Hospice, mentioned in the document, was handed over to it and incorporated with it on December 30, 1580. The conjecture of the writer of it that this "Table of Imagerie worke seemeth to have bin painted aboute an hundred yeares past" is therefore accurate. The suggestion, however, that the young King in question was St. Edmund I shall presently show to be a sheer impossibility.

But the most valuable testimony, perhaps, of all is that of another writer, Silvester de Petra Sancta, an Italian Jesuit, well known by his work *De Symbolis Heroicis*, in which he was the first to introduce the method, now in universal use, of indicating the Tinctures of Heraldry by dots and lines. In another heraldic work, entitled *Tessera Gentilitiæ ex legibus Feccialium descriptæ*,<sup>1</sup> the learned writer actually gives sketches, rough copies of which are here reproduced, of the King and Queen and of their respective shields. Of these he writes:

A very old picture is extant at the present time in Rome, in the English College, representing the figures of a King and Queen of England in splendid costumes. Each is attired in a tunic and vest, the tunic embroidered with lilies, the vest with leopards.<sup>2</sup>

The Queen wears, in addition, a cope of cloth of gold ornamented with eagles. The ancestral shields of both are depicted, blazoned with herealdic insignia corresponding to those on their dresses. The royal pair seem to be Richard II.—the successor of Edward, who was the first to quarter the French lilies with the English leopards—and Anne of Bohemia, his wife. This lady was the sister of Wenceslaus of Bohemia, King of the Romans and afterwards Emperor, for which reason her cope is embroidered and her shield charged with the Imperial eagle. King and Queen are kneeling on both knees, St. John

<sup>1</sup> Rome, 1638, pp. 677, fol. In the British Museum, s.v. Petra Sancta, 9904, m. 10.

<sup>2</sup> In a Roll of Arms of Henry III., edited by N. H. Nicholas (London, 1829), the first entry is "Le Roy d'Angleterre porte goulles trois lupards d'or." The lions of England, until the end of the fourteenth century, were generally blazoned as leopards.

Upon his shoulders a scheld of stele,  
With the lybbardes painted wele.

is introducing them to our Lady, and they are offering to the Virgin Mother of God the island of Britain, with this inscription, *Dos tua*, &c.<sup>1</sup>

This, I think, proves to demonstration that the royal personages in question are Richard II. and Anne. For if we examine



<sup>1</sup> "Species alia offert se augusta et plena regiae majestatis, in perveteri tabula, quae exstat hodieque Romae in Collegio Anglorum, cum icone Regis et Reginae Britannorum, hoc vestium ornatu. (figure of the King.) Amiciuntur ambo, tum liliato panno, tum veste leopardis picta (figure of the Queen); et Regina insuper cyclade inornatur aquilis et auro intexta; utrisque vero consentanei indumentis clypei tesserarii, hoc est eis nati, adpinguntur. (drawings of the shields.) Videntur ii esse Ricardus II. Rex, qui proximus regnavit ab Edvardo Rege, a quo coepta sunt Franciae lilia jungi leopardis Britannicis, atque Anna Bohema uxor ejus quae cum aut filia aut soror fuerit Wenceslai Bohemi Regis Romanorum ac dein etiam Imperatoris, aquila ideo insuper vestiebatur. Haerent vero nixi genibus dum interim, interprete Divo Joanne, Regiam Insulam Britanniae offerunt Deiparae Virgini cum adscripta ea epigraphe, 'Dos tua virgo pia haec est; quare rege, Maria.'"

the former of these shields we find France Ancient—that is, the fleurs-de-lys “semées,” “strewed,” or “powdered” over the field—quartered with the English lions. Now the royal arms of the French kings, the fleurs-de-lys, were introduced for the first time into the English shield by Edward III., in the thirteenth year of his reign, A.D. 1340, in consequence of his claim to the throne of France.”<sup>1</sup> Consequently the King in the picture must be Edward III., or one of his successors. It cannot be a predecessor.

Again, the fleurs-de-lys on the royal shield of England were changed from France Ancient to France Modern—that is, the lilies were reduced to three—by Henry IV. in, or about, 1405.<sup>2</sup> The shields, therefore, which we are studying, must have been painted before that date or at least must depict a King who reigned before that date. The picture, therefore, presents a King who reigned between 1340 and 1405. It must, then, be Edward III., Richard II., or Henry IV.<sup>3</sup>

If we now turn to the second shield, in which the King's arms are dimidiated with those of his Queen, it will be seen at once, from France and England, quarterly, impaled with the Imperial eagle, that this Queen could have been none other than Anne of Bohemia. We arrive at this conclusion first by a process of elimination. For neither Philippa of Hainault, the consort of Edward III., nor Joanna of Navarre, the Queen of Henry IV., nor yet Isabella of France, the second wife of Richard II., had in her shield an Eagle Displayed. The lady in question, therefore, can only be Anne. We arrive at the same conclusion also by positive evidence. For Anne was accustomed to impale with France and England, quarterly; 1 and 4, an eagle for Germany; 2 and 3, a lion rampant for Bohemia. In the second shield with which we are dealing, the Bohemian lion has been omitted by Anne and only the superior arms of Germany retained.

Against these proofs three possible objections may be urged. First, it may be contended that this cannot be Richard's shield, since his custom was to impale his hereditary quartered shield with the arms of the Confessor, a cross fleurie between five martlets. The answer to this is that such was not his invariable custom. On his Great Seal, for example, he retained the later

<sup>1</sup> Boutell, *Heraldry*, p. 295. Third Edit.

<sup>2</sup> Boutell, p. 73.

<sup>3</sup> In Sir John Gilbert's picture—now in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool—of “Richard II. resigning the crown to Bolingbroke,” the lilies on Richard's shield are erroneously represented as already reduced to three.

arms of Edward III., the lilies semées and the lions quartered. Over the entrance to Westminster Hall Richard's two shields, one with and the other without the Confessor's arms, appear on either side. Moreover, it is reasonable to suppose that in offering England to our Lady he would omit armorial insignia that had reference only to his family, and retain those only which represented the realm with which he was endowing the Queen of Heaven. Both Richard and Anne retained only their superior arms.<sup>1</sup>

Again, in reference to the second shield, it might be argued that this cannot represent Anne, the Emperor's daughter, since the Imperial eagle should be double-headed. To this the answer is at hand that the Imperial eagle was frequently blazoned single-headed. Boutell, p. 257, nn. 677 and 678, gives illustrations of the eagle both single and twi-headed; and adds<sup>2</sup> that the eagle of the Emperor charged upon the early shield in the north choir aisle of Westminster Abbey has but a single head. On this subject the following quotation is conclusive:<sup>3</sup> "In the arms of Frederick II., Emperor of Germany, who married Isabel, sister of Henry III. of England, which are sculptured in the north aisle of the nave of Westminster Abbey, the Imperial eagle has but a single head. . . . On the gold coin of this Emperor the eagle is also single-headed. Spenser says that before the Emperor Henry III. there is hardly one example of the double-headed eagle, and after his time it often has but a single head." Equally to the point is the following from *Archæologia*:<sup>4</sup> "On the tomb of Simon de Langham at Westminster the arms of Richard and his Queen are found impaled. The spread-eagle is single-headed."

Thirdly, it may be urged that Anne was a Wycliffite, and therefore was unlikely to have joined in the act of dedication of England to the Virgin Mary. Miss Strickland says: "To Anne of Bohemia is attributed the honour of being the first in that illustrious band of princesses who were the nursing mothers of the Reformation," &c.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Boutell, plate xxiii. n. 349.

<sup>2</sup> P. 452.

<sup>3</sup> *The Painted Chamber at Westminster*, p. 35. By J. G. Rokewode.

<sup>4</sup> Vol. xxix. p. 32, note 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Queens of England*, ii. p. 365. I may mention here another curious remark of Miss Strickland's. She says (p. 364): "Anne's device was a very stupid one, being an ostrich with a bit of iron in his mouth." The "bit of iron" is of course the heraldic key or horse-shoe.

Dean Stanley<sup>1</sup> joins in the same strain: "Anne of Bohemia, the patroness of the Wycliffites, the link between Wycliffe and Huss." And so the tradition is handed on from one Protestant writer to another that "Good Queen Anne" was a mediæval female Protestant. The wish, no doubt, is father to the thought in these uncritical writers, but where are the proofs? On the face of it, it is improbable that Anne adhered to "the evil parson of Lutterworth"—heresiarch, communist, prevaricator—inasmuch as she had the full sympathy of her orthodox husband, who with pride wrote on the tomb in which Anne lies buried that she "overwhelmed heretics and laid low their friends."<sup>2</sup> Secondly, there is not a shred of evidence to support the assertion. Huss, indeed, said that, according to Wycliffe, Anne used to read the Gospels in Bohemian, German, and Latin; but, as the *Dictionary of National Biography* remarks,<sup>3</sup> "this does not go far to establish any sympathy with Wycliffe's principles." Yet there is nothing else to establish it. Foxe, in his usual style, has made a mendacious statement upon this subject, but as Miss Strickland herself refutes him,<sup>4</sup> we may presume she did not base her opinion of Anne upon him. Thomas Arundel, who preached Anne's funeral sermon, "commended the Queen for reading the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue;"<sup>5</sup> yet so far was this prelate from countenancing the heresiarch, that he burnt Sawtree and Badly, and condemned Lord Cobham to the stake for holding Lollard doctrines. To read the Bible in a vulgar tongue is not the same thing as to be a Protestant. Anne's Wycliffism does not disprove the picture; the picture disproves Anne's Wycliffism.

It may now be taken as proven, I think, that the picture in question is that of Richard II. If confirmation were needed, it would be found in the very remarkable forked beard—two little tufts, like nipples, of hair on his chin, an inch or so apart. If any one will take the trouble to compare Petra Sancta's rough sketch of Richard with the monumental effigy of that monarch on his tomb in the Confessor's chapel in Westminster Abbey, or with the full-length portrait of him now hung on the

<sup>1</sup> *Westminster Abbey*, p. 143.

<sup>2</sup> "Obruit hæreticos et eorum stravit amicos."

<sup>3</sup> I. 423.

<sup>4</sup> P. 382, note 3.

<sup>5</sup> Miss Strickland, p. 382.

south wall of the Jerusalem Chamber,<sup>1</sup> it will be found how strikingly similar the tufted beard is in all the three cases. This argument from the style of beard is not, however, in itself altogether conclusive, since Henry of Lancaster before he became King Henry IV. also wore these chin tufts, as may be seen from the illuminations of the Harleian MS. n. 1319, in the British Museum, copied by Strutt in his *Regal and Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, and also reproduced in *Archæologia*, vol. xx.

It may now be of interest to gather together the scattered details we possess, in the various documents before quoted, of this interesting historical picture. It was five feet long by three feet high, and was divided into five panels. In the middle, or third, panel (numbering from right to left of the picture itself, that is from the spectator's left to right) was our Lady looking to the left. In the fourth panel, on the Virgin's left, knelt Richard II. in a scarlet robe embroidered with fleurs-de-lys semées and lions, with the globe or pattern of England in his hands,<sup>2</sup> which he is offering to Mary. His sceptre lies on a cushion at his feet.<sup>3</sup> In the same fourth panel stands St. George in armour. In the fifth panel, to the King's left, stands the Baptist acting as advocate (*interpres*) of the King to our Lady. In the second panel, to the Virgin's right, knelt Queen Anne looking to the left, as depicted by Petra Sancta. There remains only the first panel to account for, and in that, as I conjecture (for a reason presently to be mentioned), stood the King's favourite patron saints, St. Edward the Confessor, and St. Edmund, King and Martyr. The picture, it will be remembered, stood before the altar of St. Edmund.

There exists in Wilton House, the seat of Lord Pembroke, a famous diptych, containing on the right leaf a beautiful picture of Richard II., which was apparently painted about the same time and probably by the same hand, as the lost painting of the English College. The Wilton picture was engraved by Hollar, and is well known on that account. The King's portrait is skilfully reproduced in colours in Shaw's *Dresses and Decorations of the Middle Ages*, and in Green's

<sup>1</sup> This famous portrait of Richard has been restored in our day. An engraving of it as it appeared before the restoration, and when it hung in the choir, may be found in *A Catalogue of Prints engraved for the Society of Antiquaries of London*, vol. i. n. 4.

<sup>2</sup> In the Westminster portrait he holds a globe in his right hand.

<sup>3</sup> Petra Sancta depicts him as crowned, whereas the "broadside," before quoted, says "his sceptre and his crown lying before him on a cushion."



*Illustrated History of England*, vol. ii. p. 506. Both leaves of the diptych have been admirably reproduced by the Arundel Society. The following details are taken from two works, the one published in the last century,<sup>1</sup> the other, a monograph of eighty-five pages, by George Scharf, F.S.A., published in 1882 for the Arundel Society, and descriptive of their reproduction. In the right-hand leaf of the diptych kneels the figure of the youthful King crowned, with a smooth, hairless, almost girlish face; his hands outstretched to the Virgin with the Divine Child in her arms. The King is clad in a gorgeous scarlet cope, with broad hanging sleeves, embroidered in gold, with his badge of the white hart, broom-cods (as a Plantagenet), and eagles. This eagle is displayed and one-headed, and may refer to his affianced bride, Anne. Nearest to the King on his left stands the Baptist, with one hand on the King's shoulder. Next to St. John and to his right stands the Confessor, crowned, and holding a ring,<sup>2</sup> to whose right again stands St. Edmund, the Royal Martyr. One hand of each Saint is pointing to the kneeling monarch, and their eyes are directed to our Lady as presenting the suppliant to her and the Child.

In the left-hand panel of the diptych is our Lady holding in her arms the Infant Saviour. Behind are eleven angels, each bearing on the left breast the King's badge of the white hart. One of the angels holds the red-cross banner of St. George, the Patron Saint of England. At that time this was the national banner.

The diptych belonged to Charles I., to whom it was presented by Sir James Palmer, who had it of Lord Jennings (Sir Thomas Jermyn?). To Palmer's son, Roger, Earl of Castlemaine, on his departure as ambassador to Rome, the diptych was presented by James II. Consequently the two famous paintings of Richard II., the English College five-panelled *Tabula*, and the Wilton diptych, were in all probability both in Rome at the same time. On the death of Lord Castlemaine in 1705, the diptych was purchased by

<sup>1</sup> *Antiquities, &c., in Wilton House*, p. 87. By James Kennedy. 1769.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Scharf, p. 35, says this ring is connected with a legend that Edward once gave a ring from off his finger to a poor pilgrim, who proved to be St. John. But Stanley, *Westminster Abbey*, p. 142, says that Richard "had a ring which he confided to St. Edward's shrine when he was not out of England." Again, the *Versus Rhythmici de Henrico Quinto*, in the Rolls Series, *Memorials of Henry V.* p. 71, inform us that Richard II. had dedicated to St. Edward a precious ring, in which one gem was worth about 1,000 marks, equivalent to £10,000 of our money.



Thomas Herbert, eighth earl of Pembroke, and in Wilton House, the seat of that family, it has been ever since.

The striking points of resemblance between the Wilton House and the English College pictures will be evident to any one who compares them as above described ; or, better still, compares the Arundel Society's reproduction of the diptych with Petra Sancta's sketches of the Roman picture. Both Wilton and Roman pictures were on wood, panelled, and gilded. Both were painted about the same time. Both represent Richard in scarlet and heraldic dress, with his hands raised to our Lady. In both the Baptist is prominent. The Wilton contains in a conspicuous way the national banner of St. George ; the Roman contains St. George in person. In the Wilton the King has apparently handed over to the Virgin the national banner ; in the Roman he is tendering the globe of England. The Wilton represents St. John with his hand on the King's shoulder ; the Roman represents St. George in a like attitude. The Wilton contains St. Edmund ; the Roman was hung over St. Edmund's altar, and probably contained his likeness.

As to the date of the diptych, Mr. Scharf assigns the year 1381, and, telling the story of Wat Tyler's rebellion much as Father Bridgett has told it, he connects the picture with that event. As the King is beardless, and Anne is absent from the picture, it must have been painted before Richard's marriage. Can it be that, having offered himself to our Lady, he in the diptych gave only an earnest of his good faith, and afterwards in the Roman *Tabula* carried, after his marriage, the donation and endowment into full and formal effect ? Scharf<sup>1</sup> declares it to be his "strong impression that the Wilton diptych was devised for a purpose affecting the King's religious movements," and that, too, in consequence of the rebellion, and prior to his marriage. The learned antiquary would have been even more strongly impressed with this conviction had he noticed that Richard, before encountering the rebels, and after praying before the statue of Our Lady of the Pew, offered to the Virgin, not a piece of money (as Scharf implies, page 72), but *himself*. As Mr. Waterton and Father Bridgett have both pointed out, the reading in Froissart is distinctly "he offered himself to her." "*Là fit ce Roi ses oraisons devant ceste image ; et s'offrit à elle ; et puis monta à cheval,*" &c.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Scharf has been misled

<sup>1</sup> P. 83.

<sup>2</sup> Froissart, vol. ii. c. 77, p. 129. Paris Edit. 1574.

by Lord Berners' false translation, "and dyde there his offryng."<sup>1</sup>

By whom the English College picture was painted, and whether by a native or foreign artist, we can only vaguely conjecture. The nationality of the painter of the Wilton House diptych, which I have shown reason for thinking to have been by the same hand, was accepted by Waagan and J. D. Passavant as Italian; by Hookam Carpenter, sometime keeper of drawings in the British Museum, as Bohemian; while at the Manchester Exhibition, to which it was lent, it was by many competent persons considered to have been a genuine English production.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Scharf is himself of opinion that the diptych, whatever hands were employed upon it, was certainly produced in England. If the same should be true, as seems most likely, of the Roman picture, we are led on to the further question as to how it found its way to Rome.

According to the MS. broadsheet before quoted, the picture at the time the document in question was written, that is in or before 1580, belonged to St. Thomas of Canterbury's Hospice at Rome. In a work published in Rome in 1844, by the Very Rev. J. Donovan, entitled *Rome Ancient and Modern*, I find it stated, on the authority of Novaes, that this Hospice was erected in the Via di Monserrato in the fourteenth century. It was therefore built either in, or not long before, the reign of Richard II., who would in consequence take a lively interest in the new foundation, and perhaps sent the great historical painting to be placed before the altar of his patron, St. Edmund, in the church attached to the Hospice.

Where is this picture now? It long ago disappeared, when and by what agency I have been unable, after considerable research and inquiry, to ascertain. Has it perished, or is it hidden away in some European gallery? This is a question I must leave to be answered by some authority better acquainted than I am with the history of the English College in Rome.

CHARLES COUPE.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 649. London, 1812. In the Preface to this edition, the Editor says, "Lord Berners has not unfrequently misconceived, omitted, or introduced superfluously a passage or a word; this the Editor has therefore endeavoured to remedy." Why Lord Berners mistranslated this phrase, which testifies so clearly to pre-Reformation worship of our Lady, and why his Editor failed to correct his lordship's version, I leave the reader to judge for himself.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Scharf, p. 72.

## *An Apologist of a Married Clergy.*

---

MONSIEUR CHARLES LOYSON, ex-Sulpician, ex-Carmelite, ex-Conférencier of Notre Dame, ex-Curé of Geneva, ex-Rector of the Gallican Church of Paris, has published his *Last Will and Testament*.<sup>1</sup> The days of a man, he reminds us, are three score years and ten. M. Loyson has reached the age of three score years and eight, and he thinks that the time has come to publish to the world his final reaffirmation of "the truth of those principles to which he and his friends have consecrated their lives." The result is a *brochure* of something less than one hundred pages, introduced to the English public with a characteristic Preface by Dean Farrar. A note on a fly-leaf informs us that translations into several other European languages are in course of preparation. Catholics can afford to contemplate the fact with equanimity. M. Loyson's<sup>2</sup> book emphatically belongs to the class of works which, in Lord Macaulay's well-remembered phrase, intend murder and commit suicide.

The substance of the volume consists of three documents which explain, as the author declares, the three principal acts of his life militant, and which correspond with the three principal reforms of Christian society.

<sup>1</sup> *My Last Will and Testament*. By Hyacinthe Loyson (Père Hyacinthe). With a Preface by the Very Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Canterbury. London, 1895.

<sup>2</sup> It may be remarked that in referring throughout to the subject of this article as *Monsieur* rather than *Père*, I am only following the example of his own friends and supporters. In the Manifesto of the National Society for the Evangelization of France, a body whose imposing name would alone be sufficient to command respect, we find "M. Hyacinthe Loyson, rector of the Catholic Gallican Church, assisted by M. Auguste Mettetal of the Lutheran Church, and M. Théodore Monod, pastor of the Reformed Church," inviting their countrymen to join their "Institution (*sic*), if they may be allowed the expression," on the logically remarkable ground that Frenchmen have an instinctive and growing horror of sectarianism. "Institution" does not seem the happiest of terms even for "a stepping-stone to the Church of the future," but, when you come to think of it, what name *are* you to apply to the combination of three already full-grown Churches. Antiquity has not contemplated the problem.

By the first [he says], announcing my withdrawal from the most renowned pulpit in the world, that of Notre Dame de Paris, I protested against Papal Infallibility, even before that Council, which was not allowed liberty of discussion, had framed of it a false dogma. I was thus the first, though unaware of it myself, to become what has since been termed an Old Catholic.

By my second letter, written on the eve of my marriage, when celibacy was still held to be obligatory by the Old Catholics themselves, I affirmed by word and deed the inalienable right of all priests to Christian marriage.

To these letters, which have been long before the world, M. Loyson now adds a third document, which has a better claim to the name *Mon Testament*. It was drawn up in 1893, after his resignation of the rectorship of the little schismatical church he presided over in Paris, and contains a grandiloquent review of the past and vague forecasts of the future, concluding, amid many appeals to God and to conscience which jar painfully upon the Catholic reader, with the words, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. Hyacinthe Loyson, *Priest*." The slender volume is eked out with a selection of miscellaneous letters and manifestoes, affording curious sidelights upon the main features of his career, and emphasizing even to the most unobservant reader the lessons of this sad history.

The once celebrated Père Hyacinthe has so long ceased to play a conspicuous part upon the world's stage, that Dean Farrar finds it necessary in his Introduction to explain who he is and what he has done. For our present purpose it may suffice to give here a still more concise summary of facts.

Born in 1827, Charles Loyson entered St. Sulpice in 1845, was ordained priest in 1851, became a Carmelite in 1857, and was chosen to deliver the *Conférences* at Notre Dame from 1865 to 1869. The "liberal" and anti-Roman tone of his addresses in that influential position caused grave uneasiness, and after an apparently fruitless summons to Rome, the General of his Order took the final step of requiring of him either submission or silence. To this Père Hyacinthe replied by a public protestation, conceived in a tone which even his friend Montalembert, who to some extent sympathized in his views, plainly told him was inexcusable. He protested, he said, "against forms and doctrines which are called Roman, but which are not Christian." He protested against "the sacrilegious perversion of the Gospel

of the Son of God Himself, the spirit and letter of which are both alike trampled under foot by the pharisaism of the new decree" (of infallibility). This was of course a final rupture; the friar went forth into the world without seeking or at least obtaining release from his vows. He took part in the Old Catholic Congress at Bonn, he travelled and lectured on social and religious subjects in England and the United States, and in 1872 he took a yet more decisive step. It is thus that he himself speaks of that time more than twenty years afterwards:

I was excommunicated, but I remained a Catholic. The Pope can indeed cut one off from the visible Church over which he presides, but not from the invisible Church whose Head is Christ. I went to the very extreme in my holy claims for Christian liberty; three years after my excommunication I married without renouncing my priesthood. On that day I accomplished the most logical, the most courageous, I had almost said, the most Christian act of my life.<sup>1</sup>

*Omnes tumultus in nuptias exeunt*, Erasmus had mockingly said of the older Reformers his contemporaries, "All these disturbances end in a wedding;" and this was what men still said of M. Loyson, despite the high moral tone which he assumed in the letter upon his marriage. He was glad to pass into Switzerland, where he said Mass for the first time as Curé of the Gallican Catholic Church of Geneva, on May 7, 1873. But in little more than a year he found his relations with his parishioners so strained that he decided to break with these so-called Liberal Catholics, who were animated, he declared, with a spirit which was neither Liberal in politics nor Catholic in religion. Returning to Paris, he was enabled, after considerable opposition on the part of the Republican Government then in power, to deliver some courses of Conferences, but their popularity soon waned. He founded the Catholic Gallican Church of Paris, and with the aid of money supplied him from England, notably by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, and Dean Stanley, he carried on his religious services in a building formerly used as a theatre, which he purchased for the purpose. But despite this assistance, and despite all the efforts used by M. Loyson to court publicity and to push his ideas, the undertaking was constantly on the verge of financial catastrophe. Of the precise relation of cause and effect I cannot pretend to speak, but it is a fact made prominent

<sup>1</sup> P. 33.

in the little work before us, that on March 3, 1893, M. Loyson invited the Jansenists of Utrecht to take over the church in the Rue d'Arras, and himself finally abdicated all pastoral cares, declaring: "Whatever may befall me, my work is done."<sup>1</sup>

Ever since his breach with Rome, notwithstanding even his marriage, M. Loyson has taken up the extraordinary position of maintaining that he has always adhered unswervingly to the principles of the Catholic Church. Luther, he declared, was to blame because he broke with lawful traditions and necessary unity. Just as Döllinger, though contumacious and excommunicate, clung pertinaciously to the idea that by refusing to attach himself formally to any schismatical body, he remained in the same union with the body of Christ as before the Vatican decrees, so M. Loyson considers that by asserting loudly and persistently that he is a Catholic, and is determined to remain a Catholic, he constitutes in his own person a universal Church, which is the one true descendant of that founded by the Apostles. It is not to be wondered at that his rationalist critics fail to understand the attitude he has assumed, and are amused at the distinction he strives to establish between Roman and Latin Catholicism. "The ex-Père Hyacinthe," wrote George Sand, in September, 1872, "believes, but we cannot share his conviction, that henceforth he can call himself a Catholic and a priest in spite of all. The distinction that he wishes to establish between the Roman and the Latin Church appears rather arbitrary to us, and we recognize in it a touch of the subtlety of the ecclesiastic. As far as we are concerned, he is a perfect heretic; and we congratulate him on it, for heresies are the great vitality of the Christian ideal."<sup>2</sup> After the lapse of twenty-three years, M. Loyson still calls himself a Catholic, interested "in the restoration of the ancient Church of France."<sup>3</sup> And yet there is, he tells us, no eternal Hell,<sup>4</sup> there is no original sin<sup>5</sup>—what view he holds of Baptism, in the absence of the doctrine of original sin, does not appear—the first pages of Genesis are a symbol to explain the moral decay of the early races of mankind;<sup>6</sup> indeed, in *Mon Testament* he seems even to suggest that direct revelation is impossible.<sup>7</sup> M. Loyson

<sup>1</sup> The facts just quoted are all derived from that useful work, Vapereau's *Dictionnaire des Contemporains*, a compilation, as is well known, of by no means distinctively Catholic sympathies.

<sup>2</sup> P. 74.    <sup>3</sup> P. 39.    <sup>4</sup> P. 47.    <sup>5</sup> P. 45.    <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*    <sup>7</sup> P. 42.



avows that he is equally unable to sign the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican communion, and the Creed of Pope Pius IV. accepted by the Jansenists of Utrecht. Surely, if the ex-friar is still a Catholic, it is only in the same sense that a member of the Salvation Army may call himself a military man, or a housemaid out for a holiday is described as a lady.

At the same time, the exigencies of his isolated position suggesting the desirability of making common cause with other schismatical bodies, M. Loyson has ingeniously reconciled his Catholicism with a most considerate regard for their susceptibilities even in the matter of a name. At the time the church in the Rue d'Arras was handed over to the Utrecht Jansenists, in 1893, M. Loyson, speaking in grandiloquent terms of those who had sunk their differences in order to act with him, described them as men who had thereby "taken rank among the founders of the Church of the future." The faith which he advocated was to be Evangelical without being Protestant, Catholic without being Roman; but this was not inconsistent with its being described as Protestant as well as Catholic, "Protestant to reject error, Catholic to guard the truth." At the same time it was not the faith of Luther or of Calvin, not that of the Popes, nor of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, nor of the Archbishops of Canterbury, but it was the faith of the Apostles, of the early believers, of the early Councils of the Church Universal. "It is this faith," M. Loyson concluded, in his eloquent peroration, "which enlightens and purifies souls, which raises the nations which have fallen, it is this faith which, when it has been preached in France, will save her. Amen."<sup>1</sup>

A few days after this brilliant oratorical effort, M. Loyson made over to the care of the Jansenist Archbishop of Utrecht "all the administrative charges," to use his own words, "confided to me by our Catholic Gallican Church, begging you, Monseigneur, to consult with it, as early as possible, regarding my successor, and from this moment to take under your direction the work of Catholic Reform in France." It is "the venerable Church of Utrecht," he says again, in the same letter, "the inheritor of the spirit of Port Royal, which is destined by Providence—who can doubt it?—to come to the aid of the French Catholics."<sup>2</sup>

Alas for the blight which dogs the steps of schism! The last document of the volume from which I am quoting is

<sup>1</sup> P. 89.<sup>2</sup> P. 72.



entitled "Supplementary Note." It is dated November 30th, 1894, and opens thus :

The hopes which I had placed in the ancient Church of Utrecht have been cruelly deceived.

I regret to say that the representatives of this Church have not understood the mission they had to fulfil in France. The work which they are endeavouring to found here, and which has hardly anything save its name in common with that which they were pledged to continue, is doomed at its birth. Instead of a broad centre of apostleship, liberal and French, as well as Evangelical, they have a little chapel which bears the distinctive marks of a foreign nationality and a superannuated theology. The church I gave over into their hands was full to overflowing ; in a few weeks it was almost entirely abandoned by its congregation.

And so this very eclectic faith, which is both Catholic and Protestant, and yet is neither, which Popes of Rome, and Patriarchs of Constantinople, and Archbishops of Canterbury, have all alike failed to understand, but which it has been reserved to M. Loyson to announce to a perverse and unsympathetic generation, remains the exclusive inheritance of Madame Loyson and her son, to whom, and to posterity, the prophet sorrowfully bequeaths them. Let us hope that there are more material resources of which the *Will and Testament* takes no account, for, from a worldly point of view, the creed of the Catholic Gallican Church seems likely to afford but a slender provision. M. Loyson's motto, Dean Farrar tells us, is *Futura prospice*. We fear that the ex-Père Hyacinthe, and those who think like him, will only too often have to find their consolation in a morrow which never comes.

And yet there is throughout a certain tone of arrogance about M. Loyson's pronouncements, which the most anti-Papal of critics can hardly approve. Thus he is evidently proud of the document which, on the eve of his marriage, he addressed from London to Pope Pius IX. in August, 1872, containing sentences like this : "I await with confidence from the successor to your Holiness in the Primacy, the retraction, or at least the explanation, of dogmas which, in their actual form, are contrary alike to truth and tradition." Well would it have been for M. Loyson if he had listened to the advice proffered him with infinite charity nearly two years before in the most interesting of the documents printed in this volume.

*Letter from Cardinal Newman.*

The Oratory, Nov. 24, 1870.

MY DEAR FATHER HYACINTHE,—I am always glad to hear from you and of you.

It grieved me bitterly that you should have separated yourself from the One True Fold of Christ; and it grieves me still more to find from your letter that you are still in a position of isolation.

I know how generous your motives are, and how much provocation you as well as others have received in the ecclesiastical events which have been passing around us. But nothing which has taken place justifies our separation from the One Church.

There is a fable in one of our English poets, of which the moral is given thus :

Beware of dangerous steps ; the darkest day,  
Live till to-morrow, will have passed away.

Let us be patient ; the turn of things may not take place in our time ; but there will be surely, sooner or later, an energetic and a stern nemesis for imperious acts, such as now afflict us.

The Church is the Mother of high and low, of the rulers as well as of the ruled. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*. If she declares by her various voices that the Pope is infallible in certain matters, in those matters infallible he is. What Bishops and people say all over the earth, that is the truth, whatever complaint we may have against certain ecclesiastical proceedings. Let us not oppose ourselves to the universal voice.

God bless you and keep you. Yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Cardinal Newman himself, as is well known, had not been without his own interior and exterior trials during those two eventful years, but it is quite clear that the motive which inspires his letter, is the wish even to exaggerate his sympathy and fellow-feeling, if so be he may gain the confidence of the poor wandering sheep, and may induce him to enter into himself before it is too late. Well had it been for M. Loyson if he had listened to this most gentle and Christian warning, and imitated the submission of an intellect far nobler and more spiritual than his own.

To the majority, however of English readers, M. Loyson's religious views and disappointments are probably matters of little concern, and it will be rather in the hope of finding a trenchant attack on clerical celibacy, a subject which for some unexplained reason has lately come to the fore, that they may be induced to look into the pages of this pamphlet. In this

matter also it may be safely said that M. Loyson will afford them slender satisfaction. But before making such comments on the subject as the book before us suggests, it may be worth while to devote a few moments to a question of historical fact raised by a footnote of M. Loyson's. It is a statement to which a reviewer<sup>1</sup> of the book has already given prominence, taking occasion therefrom to comment severely upon "the ill-guarded words of that disingenuous 'reforming Pope,' Pius IV."

Having occasion to state in his letter on his marriage, that the law of clerical celibacy is not a matter of faith but of discipline, M. Loyson appends the following footnote, which I give entire:

See the two magnificent addresses, *pro conjugii libertate*, which the learned Andrew Dudith of Buda, Bishop of Tinina (*sic*), delivered before the Council of Trent.<sup>2</sup> It is well known that at this same Council, the King of France and the Emperor of Germany earnestly besought the abolition of the ecclesiastical law enforcing celibacy. The Pope, Pius IV., replied as follows: "It is evident that if the marriage of the clergy were sanctioned, it would sever them from their dependence on the Holy See, as their affections would be turned aside from it, and would centre in their wives, their children, and their country; to allow them to marry would mean the destruction of the hierarchy, and would lower the rank of Pope to that of a mere Bishop of Rome."

Now it is interesting to trace the genesis of these scraps of fictitious history. It should be remarked in the first place that this footnote is not to be found in the brochure in which M. Loyson's letter first appeared by itself in 1872. In 1877, however, M. Loyson printed some of his addresses delivered at that period in Paris,<sup>3</sup> and by way of Appendix added the *Lettre sur mon Mariage*, a document which its author seems never to lose an opportunity of bringing to public notice. In this edition of the letter, the note appears exactly as it stands in the *Will and Testament* of this year, and equally without any sort of reference. Now despite a search made among the documents printed by Le Plat, Theiner, Döllinger, Mendham, and

<sup>1</sup> In the *Daily Chronicle*, May 11th, 1895.

<sup>2</sup> It is worth while to notice, as an indication of the writer's inaccuracy, that these speeches, or rather this speech, as Dudith himself states, was *not* actually delivered before the Council. It was prepared for it, but not spoken for want of opportunity. (Cf. Theiner, *Die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit*, vol. iii. p. 915.) Dudith afterwards apostatized and took a wife. (See Menzel, *Neuere Geschichte*, iv. p. 257.)

<sup>3</sup> *Trois Conférences au Cirque d'Hiver*. Par Hyacinthe Loyson, Prêtre. Paris, 1877.

others, I have not been able to come upon any letters of Pius IV. containing words in the least resembling those which M. Loyson imputes to him. It happens, however, that a certain "Abbé" F. Chavard, a French priest like M. Loyson married and excommunicate, has written a work entitled, *Le Célibat des Prêtres et ses Conséquences*. This appeared at Geneva in 1874, at the time that M. Loyson was residing there; it is dedicated to M. Loyson, and it prints a complimentary letter from M. Loyson to the author amongst its prefatory matter. M. Chavard devotes a chapter to the Council of Trent, and there he takes occasion to extol the *deux magnifiques harangues* against the law of celibacy, delivered by *le savant André Dudith de Bude, Evêque de Tinina. (sic.)*<sup>1</sup> Immediately after the short summary which he gives of Dudith's discourse, M. Chavard passes on to speak of the attitude of Pius IV., on the question of the marriage of priests, and he refers to a Consistory held by that Pontiff in the November of 1561, in which one of the Cardinals, according to Paolo Sarpi, made a remarkable speech. In that speech, supposed to have been delivered by the Cardinal de Carpi, we recognize the exact sentiments, which in a somewhat more compendious form M. Loyson has set down as the "disingenuous" language of Pius IV. himself. M. Chavard, it may be mentioned, states as clearly as words can express it, that he is quoting from a speech of Cardinal de Carpi, and he gives a correct reference to his authority, Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent*.<sup>2</sup>

Now when we remember that the footnote was not at first printed with M. Loyson's letter, but is found there only after the appearance of Chavard's book, when we note the remarkable coincidence that Dudith's full style which is wont to appear in so many various forms<sup>3</sup> is given by Chavard and Loyson in exactly the same shape and with the same misprint, when we observe that the reference to Dudith in Chavard is immediately followed by the account of Cardinal de Carpi's supposed speech, and in Loyson by words to the same effect said to occur in an

<sup>1</sup> P. 421.

<sup>2</sup> Book v. In the Amsterdam Edition of 1736, in French, with Courayer's notes, the passage is found in vol. ii. p. 129.

<sup>3</sup> Sarpi calls him André Duditz, Evêque de Tininia; Pallavicini (French Edition), André Dudicio Spardellato, Evêque de Tine; Michaud, *Biographie Universelle*, André Dudith, Evêque de Tina. In Gams he appears as Andreas Duditius, Episcopus Tiniensis (Knin), and Knin is also the name of the see as it appears in Mas Latrie. In none of these is his birthplace Buda mentioned as if it were part of his name.

official letter of Pius IV., it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that M. Chavard's book is the one and only authority for M. Loyson's footnote. What is more, I fear that the too accurate transfer of Dudith's name can hardly have been made by one who was quoting from memory, and that consequently when he substitutes Pius IV.'s authority for that of his Cardinal, and adds inverted commas as if he were making an exact quotation from a formal document, we have not before us a mere slip due to inaccurate recollection. But if this is M. Loyson's idea of candour and straightforwardness in a matter of mere historical criticism, what weight are we to attach to his protestations about his motives in marrying and other secrets of conscience, in which, as he clearly perceives, his credit and reputation are deeply interested?

A word may be added upon the authenticity of the speech attributed by Fra Paolo to Cardinal de Carpi. According to the Venetian historian's printed text, the Consistory took place upon December 10th. Cardinal Pallavicini, however, with much more authentic sources of information at command, denies that any Consistory was held upon that day,<sup>1</sup> and Sarpi's editor, Courayer, agrees with Pallavicini. What is more, Courayer, the same French ecclesiastic whose ardent Anglican sympathies earned for him a tomb in Westminster Abbey, declares in his notes that he gravely doubts if Cardinal de Carpi could ever have expressed himself in any such terms as Fra Paolo attributes to him. If the Consistory to which the historian is referring is really that held on November 10th, it seems certain from the account of the French Ambassador,<sup>2</sup> de l'Isle, that the question of the marriage of the clergy was not discussed at it. In any case the inaccuracies and the bitter partisan spirit of the excommunicated Fra Paolo are sufficiently notorious to rob his narrative of all authority in an assertion for which he offers no evidence, and which his warm admirers admit to be in conflict both with antecedent probability and ascertained facts.<sup>3</sup> It is hardly necessary to add that the actual

<sup>1</sup> Pallavicini, bk. xv. c. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Dupleix, *Mémoires*, pp. 116, 117.

<sup>3</sup> Although Sarpi, in bk. vii. c. 70, *Istoria* (Micanzio's Edition, 1858), vol. vi. p. 88, repeats the same statement in almost the same terms, this time as the ground why the Legates were blamed for allowing the subject to be discussed in the Council, he quotes no evidence, and the reference he gives in the margin to Visconti's *Despatches* proves to have nothing to do with the question.

As for the substance of the deliberations upon the marriage of priests in the Council, they may all be found summarized in Theiner, *Acta Concilii Tridentini*, vol. ii. pp. 251—262.

replies which were returned by the Pope, to the frequent solicitations of the King of France and Emperor of Germany, and which may be read in Le Plat, are conceived in quite a different spirit.

But to return to M. Loyson's *Will and Testament*. It was said above, that it is a work which will afford but little satisfaction to those who may seek to find in it new arguments against sacerdotal celibacy. The author's position with regard to this question is hardly less singular than the attitude he has assumed towards Catholic dogma and the "Church of the Future." The whole of his argumentation reduces itself to this, first, that marriage is in itself a holy state, a position which no Catholic thinks of denying, and secondly that man's right to take to himself a partner of his joys and sorrows is an inalienable one of which nobody can divest himself by any undertaking or vow. I have not the least intention of discussing so extravagant a contention in these pages; it will be quite sufficient to say that the logical outcome of this principle would be that no man can enter into a contract which may place restraint upon his future liberty. M. Loyson does not contend that celibacy is wrong and against the law of nature. On the contrary, he professes the utmost veneration for those to whom this exceptional call is given. Neither does he maintain that it is a burden beyond human power of endurance. Far from that, he goes out of his way to make public profession:

I owe to religious celibacy some of the most exquisite joys, some of the most profound and decisive experiences of my existence. From the age of eighteen, when I chose it for my lot, to the age of forty-five, I observed it with a fidelity for which I give glory to God.

This explanation, it must be owned, is not in accord with the popular feeling, prejudice though it may be, as to the soul history of those who emancipate themselves from their solemn vows of chastity, but one is glad to accept M. Loyson's own testimony as to the integrity of the years of his life as a cleric. Neither, again, need it be supposed that that is a common experience which is recorded in a letter of congratulation to M. Loyson from one who had himself but recently renounced celibacy:

I continued in this state [says the writer] until the age of thirty-five, and like you I am able, by the grace of God, to say this for myself, that I kept my resolution with unswerving fidelity.



Well, at that age, when I continued to observe the strictest celibacy, and when I thought less than ever of marrying, I happened one Sunday—I shall never forget the day—to read a book on entomology. The author, in speaking of a certain butterfly, said that after having accomplished the reproduction of its species, it died, having thus fulfilled what Nature, and consequently God, expected of it. And man, I said to myself, does not he rebel against the law of Nature if he does not marry? Does not God speak most distinctly in this very law, which is one of His own laws? Can I without blasphemy shut my eyes to the light, and stop my ears, were it even to devote myself more completely to pious meditation? From that day, sir, I was enlightened as St. Paul was on his way to Damascus. My reason, my principles, the very religious spirit which had made me hold aloof from marriage, gave me no rest until I had found a wife.

One trembles to think of the agitations of a mind which succumbs so easily to the argument from analogy. Reading a treatise on Horticulture, our philosopher would discover that the most highly cultivated plants purchase their beauty by the sacrifice of their fertility, whereupon it would at once become his duty to hie him back to the cloister and to leave his wife and children to the operation of Nature's great law of the survival of the fittest.

It is easy to understand M. Loyson's wish to show that his own unusual experience is not without a parallel, but the suspicion suggests itself all the same that in printing this letter in full he must himself be slightly deficient in a sense of humour. The most interesting part of *Mon Testament*, therefore, in so far as it bears upon the question of clerical celibacy, lies rather in what it does *not* say. There are, as Cardinal Newman has shown with masterly skill in the fourth of his *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics*, two distinct types of those who renounce the Catholic faith. In the first place there are those who with perhaps much bitterness of heart retain some measure of self-respect, and a certain natural integrity, which prevents them from lending their support to any of the more flagrant calumnies against the Church they have abandoned. Such a man was Blanco White; such, at a later date, have been Dollinger and Renan, and nearly all who have had any sort of standing, or any reputation to lose. Others again there are whose fall is as the fall of Belial, apostates who throw all truth and shame and decency to the winds. Such was Achilli and such was Maria Monk, and they too have had many imitators in our own days. Now, as



Cardinal Newman remarks, the attacks of the former class of assailants of the Church nearly always fall flat upon the ear of the Protestant tradition. They tell what is substantially the truth, and their revelations always fall far short of the anticipations of those who read them or come to hear them. It is for this reason that it seems to me that M. Loyson's book, however bitter the spirit which breathes in it, is little to be feared. The bigoted or the prurient who turn to it to fill their minds with the secret scandals of clerical celibacy, are doomed to be disappointed. No doubt M. Loyson may have occasionally come across such scandals. Here and there there are priests who fall and who secretly or openly blaspheme the chains that bind them. Such men, too, if they can safely do so under the shelter of anonymity, will gladly represent their brethren to be as deeply infected as themselves, hoping thereby to smooth the way for some great *bouleversement* of religious society which may set them free. But M. Loyson is either too honest or too well aware that the common sense of his countrymen would not credit him, to represent the French clergy as immoral, or as undermined by secret infidelity and groaning under their bonds. Even in 1893 he still speaks of the clergy of St. Sulpice as "that grave and gentle priestly family which I had chosen as my own;" he still speaks of the Carmelite Order as "that to which I belonged for ten years of my life and of which I always retain a reverent recollection," and in reprinting the letter on his marriage of 1872, he once more tells the world :

I am aware of the true state of our clergy. I know of the self-sacrifice and virtues within its ranks. But I am not ignorant of the fact that a large number of its members need to be reconciled with the interests, the affections, and the duties of human nature, as well as with those of the community at large. It is only by tearing himself away from the traditions of a blind asceticism, and of a theocracy still more political than religious, that the priest will become once more a man and a citizen. He will find himself at the same time more truly a priest.

It is only in such vague and studiously measured terms as these that M. Loyson refers to possible infidelities among a body of men whose moral condition is often painted in such lurid colours.

But let us take another witness. Dean Farrar remarks in his Preface that subsequently to a visit to London in 1871, Père Hyacinthe "joined the Old Catholic movement, and had

much intercourse with the learned and illustrious Döllinger." It is no doubt true that there was one period when M. Loyson was on intimate terms with Döllinger, but we notice that this is a subject on which M. Loyson himself observes a judicious reticence. In 1873, not long after Père Hyacinthe, in the phrase of Augustus Theiner, "like a regular French Hotspur, crossed the Rubicon" and took to himself a wife, a lady writing to Döllinger, expressed her disgust that Loyson had gone to Geneva and would needs present himself everywhere in the character of an Old Catholic. Alas! said Döllinger in his sympathetic reply, "the scandal (*Uebelstand*) that Hyacinthe Loyson should call himself one of us, only shows that we Old Catholics are still unfortunately like a town without walls and gates, into which every vagabond is free to enter as he lists."<sup>1</sup> This seems strong language, but Döllinger's opinions as to a celibate clergy were of the strongest, and even if there had not been a serious breach between himself and M. Loyson before, the latter's marriage had thoroughly disgusted him. "When a priest," Döllinger wrote to an Old Catholic friend in 1876, "can no longer point to the personal sacrifice which he makes for the good of his people, then is it all over with him and the cause which he represents. He sinks to the level of men who make a living by their work. (*Er rangiert dann mit den Gewerbetreibenden.*)"<sup>2</sup> He expresses the same idea more at large in a letter printed by Mr. Plummer in the *Expositor*.

You in England cannot understand how completely engrained it is into our people that a priest is a man who sacrifices himself for the sake of his parishioners. He has no children of his own, in order that all the children in the parish may be his children. His people know that his small wants are supplied, and that he can devote all his time and thought to them. They know also that it is quite otherwise with the married pastors of the Protestants. The pastor's income may be enough for himself, but it is not enough for his wife and children also. In order to maintain them he must take other work literary or scholastic, only a portion of his time can be given to his people; and they know that when the interests of his family and those of his flock collide, his family come first and his flock second. In short, he has a profession or trade, a *Gewerbe*, rather than a vocation, he has to earn a livelihood. In almost all Catholic congregations, a priest who married

<sup>1</sup> See the masterly work of Father Michael, S.J.: *Ignaz von Döllinger. Eine Charakteristik*. Third Edition, 1894, p. 249.

<sup>2</sup> Michael, op. cit. p. 294.

would be ruined; all his influence would be gone. The people are not at all ready for so fundamental a change, and the circumstances of the clergy do not admit of it. It is a fatal resolution.<sup>1</sup>

These words were presumably written with reference to the action of the Old Catholics in abolishing clerical celibacy. It was a step, says Döllinger's Anglican admirer, which for the last fifteen years of his life "grieved him sorely," and was one of the things which kept him from any formal participation in the Old Catholic communion.

It is surely a significant fact that a scholar who had steeped his mind in the scandals of the more corrupt periods of Christianity, and whose tendency was to deepen rather than to extenuate the shadows, one acquainted with the practical working of the confessional, and in acute revolt against all that might be considered as the tyranny of Rome, should still speak so strongly on the question of clerical celibacy. The fact is that Döllinger knew that the occasional scandals in the ranks of the priesthood were no more the effect of compulsory celibacy, than the breaches of the marriage vow can be considered the effect of the law that a man shall be faithful to one wife. He knew well that scandals there will always be, that human nature is frail, that the neglect of prayer and the decay of principle bring with them as an inevitable retribution, the enervation of will which makes the yoke once lightly carried an insupportable burthen. But we do not abolish our marriage laws because a few individuals, sometimes afflicted by cruel misfortune, but far more frequently reaping the consequences of their own inconceivable folly, vent their bitterness in anonymous letters to a newspaper declaring that marriage is a failure, or worse, a curse. Döllinger had learnt this much at least, when after fifty years of intimate intercourse with priests of all nations and conditions, he severed himself from communion with Rome, that a celibate life is not beyond the reach of ordinary men when God's grace helps them. Marriage at such an age had no

<sup>1</sup> *The Expositor*, December, 1890, p. 470. "Recollections of Dr. Döllinger," by Alfred Plummer. Compare the following very wise reflection: "And on the other hand, Protestants, remembering certain exhortations of St. Paul, ought to allow that it well befits the Church to have a class of ministers who voluntarily renounce family life, in order to devote themselves exclusively to the service of their flock, and to offer to that body of the laity who, in these days, are compelled by poverty or their station in life to remain unmarried, an example of continence which might else be represented as impossible." (Döllinger, *Lectures on the Reunion of Churches*. Eng. Tr. p. 156.)

temptations for him. He was able to judge the question with a calm and impartiality which must have been not a little galling to men like M. Loyson in the lust and prime of their manhood. And yet despite the isolated position in which that judgment placed him, it was Döllinger's deliberate conviction that the law of celibacy was essential to the well-being of the Church.

It is not my object here to write an essay on this topic, or I might quote the many wise and temperate remarks on the same subject made by Cardinal Newman in the lecture above referred to. Let me appeal instead to the testimony of a very different person, a witness of unquestionable impartiality, with every opportunity of knowing the truth—M. Renan :

The fact is, that what is commonly said about the morality of the clergy, is, as far as my experience goes, absolutely devoid of foundation. I spent thirteen years of my life under the charge of priests, and I never saw the shadow of a scandal (*je n'ai pas vu l'ombre d'un scandale*); I have known no priests but good priests. The confessional may possibly be productive of evil in some countries, but I saw no trace of it in my life as an ecclesiastic.<sup>1</sup>

Side by side with this let us set some remarks of George Sand, taken from the letter upon Père Hyacinthe's marriage already referred to above. It shows the light in which even from her infidel standpoint she contemplated the idea of confession to a married priest.

Will Père Hyacinthe still hear confessions?<sup>2</sup> That is the question. Is the secrecy of the confessional compatible with the mutual confi-

<sup>1</sup> Speaking of the practice of confession in his school-days, M. Renan adds: "The old-fashioned prayer-book I used for my examinations of conscience was innocence itself. There was only one sin which excited my curiosity, and made me feel uneasy. I was afraid that I might have committed it unawares. One day I took my courage in both hands, and I showed my confessor the question which troubled me. This was how it ran: 'Have you been guilty of simony in the collation of benefices?' I asked my confessor what that meant. Could I possibly have committed such a sin. The good man reassured me and told me that that was out of my power altogether." (*Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse*, p. 139.)

<sup>2</sup> All the kind friends who have helped M. Fabian Ware, B.ès Sc., in the English rendering of *Mon Testament*, and to whom he professes abundant gratitude, have not saved him from some very ridiculous mistranslations. Here and elsewhere he makes obvious nonsense of the context by translating *confesser* confess. "Would Père Hyacinthe still confess?" Two lines lower down he speaks of the "effusion," meaning presumably effusiveness "of conjugal love." On p. 30 he makes M. Loyson talk of two wounds of society "which are the parents of one another." I wonder on what philosophical or physiological principles two things can be the parents of one another.

dences of conjugal love? If I were a Catholic I would say to my children, "Have no secrets which cost too much in the telling, and you will have no cause to fear the gossip of the vicar's wife." But I have no wish to jest upon this subject. I am convinced that those pious ladies who follow M. Hyacinthe Loyson in his new career may still open their souls to him in perfect safety, and I wish him many faithful penitents. They will have taken a step of great service to the Church, and they will protest against one of the principal causes of her dissolution.

It has been hinted above that M. Loyson must be somewhat lacking in a sense of humour. We may at least admire his boldness in printing such criticisms, even though, as I understand, auricular confession is not now included among the tenets of the Catholic Gallican Church. Again, it is somewhat ludicrous to find included in the volume a prose poem of St. Methodus (*sic*) in praise of virginity, which M. Loyson translated in his old student days at St. Sulpice, when preparing for the reception of Holy Orders. "This poem," he writes, "has had a deep and lasting influence on my spiritual life." It is true that this song was composed in praise of virginity, but M. Loyson explains that he understands it now not of virginal, but of conjugal chastity, which is, he assures us, substantially the same thing. Poor St. Methodius! It was bad enough to have his name misprinted a dozen times over as if he were a sort of eponymous patron of the Methodists (*non repugnantibus*, it would appear, the Rev. Bruce Cornford, M.A., and that eminent Patristic student, Dean Farrar), but it was rather too much to convert his "Banquet of the Ten Virgins" into a kind of *epithalamium* for the nuptials of an ex-Carmelite friar. *M. Loyson, parait-il, ne voit pas les inconvénients*, and he even quotes with engaging frankness the observation of M. Guizot, "in which, he regrets to say, there is a good deal of truth:"

There are many people in France who do not believe in the existence of God, but who do believe in the celibacy of priests.

But despite many ludicrous incongruities which can only raise a smile in a Catholic reader, it must be said in conclusion that the deepest impression left by M. Loyson's *Last Will and Testament* is a very sad one. It is easy to see that the ex-Père Hyacinthe is a man of high gifts and noble impulses, who has enjoyed many great graces and abused them. M. Loyson has taken his own course, and he lets us understand that his mind

is made up to carry it through to the end. He has made his bed, and he will lie upon it without too much complaining. Still, it does not need much reading between the lines to see that the record of his life is a record of bitter disappointments. Only a few years since, Döllinger, the great Church historian once so courted and flattered, went to render his account in an extreme old age, writing piteously to his Anglican friends, *Je suis isolé*. And now here again we have another version of the same old story, the bough lopped from the parent stem which falls to earth withering and unfertile. It is passing strange that Dean Farrar in his Preface can quote, as if they made in M. Loyson's favour, the lines—

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,  
The eternal years of God are hers ;  
But Error wounded writhes in pain  
And dies amid her worshippers.

It must be the prayer of all good Catholics that M. Loyson, before he goes to meet his Judge, may have the grace to make another and a better Testament than the one which lies before us.

HERBERT THURSTON.

## *The Jesuits in Canada.*

---

WE have heard much of the early Jesuit missions to India, China, Japan, and Corea. All honour to those servants of God who gave their lives for the Gospel of Christ in the far East, but the West too can show equal examples of heroism. The story of the Jesuit missions to Canada, although it has found Protestant historians in Bancroft and Parkman, and a Catholic historian in Shea, is still not so well known as it deserves to be. We owe our thanks, therefore, to Père Rouvier, for a book recently published, *Au Berceau de l'autre France*,<sup>1</sup> in which we can read the marvellous tale written with full sympathy for the chief actors. The materials are ample. For forty years the Superior of the mission at Quebec sent to the Provincial of the Jesuits at Paris long and detailed reports, which were annually published, and form the series of Jesuit *Relations*. These reports are in the highest degree valuable for evidence of the condition of the native inhabitants in the seventeenth century, and their authenticity and trustworthiness have never been questioned. The entire series was published in four large volumes by the Canadian Government, in 1858.

Père Rouvier deals with his subject biographically, giving an account of the Fathers who were engaged in the Huron mission, but it is also partly his object to vindicate the Jesuits from the reproach of not having been patriots as well as evangelists. Their first aim was of course the conversion of souls, but it is abundantly clear from their actions and their narratives, that they did what they could to spread the influence and civilization of France by all legitimate methods. At home they personally recruited for colonists and encouraged them to come out by their letters from Canada.

If these countries [writes Père Le Jeune, the Superior at Quebec, in 1635] are peopled with French, not only do we weaken the strength of the foreigner, who keeps on his ships, in his towns, and his armies a

<sup>1</sup> *Au Berceau de l'autre France.* Par le Père Fréd. Rouvier, C. de J. Paris : Victor Retaux et Fils.



great number of Frenchmen in his pay; not only do we banish famine from the houses of an immense number of poor workmen; but we also strengthen France; for those who will be born in New France will be Frenchmen, and, at need, will be able to render good service to their King, which one ought not to expect from those who are settled among our neighbours. . . . It cannot be doubted that there can be found here employment for all kinds of artisans. Why should not the great forests of New France furnish ships to the old France? Who doubts that there are here mines of iron and copper and other metals? Already some have been discovered and are about to be worked. All those, therefore, who work in wood and in iron will find occupation. Wheat will grow here as well as in France. I do not profess to report all the advantages of the country, nor to show all that can occupy the mind and body of us French. I will content myself with saying that it would be an honour and a great benefit both to new and old France to found colonies and to rear many people in lands which have been lying fallow since the creation.

The Father, then, after giving details, traces a programme of colonization, both for well-to-do people and for artisans, which shows as much wisdom as knowledge of the country, and concludes with two pieces of practical advice.

Firstly, if for clearing the land they can have men who have an interest in the work, it will be best. Men who are paid wages for the most part resemble those of our neighbours who have no sooner passed the Equator than they all call themselves gentlemen and refuse to work. When they see themselves obliged to work on their own account, they won't go to sleep. Secondly, I beg those who come, to come with the desire to do their best. New France will one day be a terrestrial paradise, if our Lord continues to shower upon it His blessings both bodily and spiritual. But meantime its first inhabitants must do what Adam had received commandment to do after his fall. God had placed him there to prosper by his own toil and to keep the earth in order by his vigilance; not to do nothing and dwell in idleness.

The intention of the early explorers, Cartier and Champlain, had no doubt been rather to promote the spread of the Catholic religion than to provide an outlet for the population of France. Wherever Cartier landed he planted the Cross, affirming in this way that if he had in his heart the love of his country, he bore there also the love of the Saviour of the world, and that while caring for the interests of the former, he never forgot the glory of his God.<sup>1</sup> Champlain, going further, writes in his narrative of 1632: "Neither the capture of fortresses, nor the winning of

<sup>1</sup> Rouvier, p. 23.

battles, nor the conquest of the country, are anything in comparison with the salvation of souls, and the conversion of an infidel is worth more than the conquest of a kingdom." These sentiments may seem too heroic for a founder of colonies, and, as we have seen, the Jesuit Fathers leavened them with more worldly wisdom, but at any rate they form a striking and welcome contrast to the conduct of most explorers, both ancient and modern. It was Champlain who invited the Jesuits to Canada, and the first band of them arrived at Quebec in 1611. At this time the possessions of France in the New World consisted nominally of vast tracts of country on both sides of the St. Lawrence, but in reality they were confined to a few posts along its banks. The chief station was Quebec, which was the seat of Government. There were a few huts at Three Rivers, nearly a hundred miles further up, and at a later time (1640) Montreal was settled by a party under Maisonneuve. In 1641 the whole population of New France was reckoned at only three hundred souls. But it was not so much the prominence given in Canada to religion, as the niggardly policy of the Government at home, that prevented the colony from reaching any degree of worldly prosperity. The Company of Merchants, in soliciting from Louis XIII. the monopoly of the fur trade, had undertaken to transport to Canada artisans and farm-labourers. But, with an exclusive view to their own gain, the speculators, of whom the Company chiefly consisted, refused to carry out their bargain, fearing, says Champlain, to see their authority diminished, if the French established themselves there in great numbers. Moreover, the few that did settle were not allowed to cultivate the land, but were fed by provisions sent out annually from France, for fear they might make themselves independent! Under such management, as shortsighted as it was unjust, it was hardly to be expected that any colony would increase in numbers or wealth.

These remarks, however, are chiefly made to clear the Jesuits from the reproach—often levelled against them—of entirely neglecting the interests of this world. They are perhaps more generally reproached with being too much engrossed with this life, with their astuteness, intrigues, and deception. But the world never cares to be consistent, and any stone is good enough to throw at the Jesuits. Père Rouvier confines his history to that of the Huron mission, which lasted only a little over twenty years, but we shall soon see that he has done well

in this, that thereby he has secured a dramatic unity of time and place which prevents the reader from being distracted by multiplicity of details. The Hurons inhabited a comparatively small tract of country between the south-east side of the Georgian Bay of the great Lake Huron and Lake Simcoe. To the north and along the banks of the Ottawa were the widely-spread Algonquins. To the south the Tionnontates or Tobacco Nation. Further south and east, between Lakes Ontario and Erie, were the Neutral Nation, so called because they held themselves aloof in the perpetual strife of the Hurons and the Iroquois. Along the south side of Lake Ontario and extending eastward to the Hudson River were the ferocious Iroquois, the most dreaded of all the Indian tribes in this part of America. They were divided into five Nations, the most prominent of whom were the Mohawks. The Hurons dwelt in a land of marshes and forests. In summer the heat was overpowering and the insects intolerable. In winter snow covered up all tracks. Their cabins were then rendered almost uninhabitable through smoke, and it was sometimes necessary to remain for hours with one's face to the earth to prevent suffocation. We have in the Jesuit *Relations* minute accounts of the way of living and the character of this people. Their cabins were sometimes of an enormous length, one is mentioned of above two hundred feet. Young trees, planted at fixed intervals, formed the sides, with their branches and foliage which were joined at the top. Poles were fixed transversely to bind them together, and the whole was covered with layers of bark. At the top and throughout the length an opening was made of about a foot wide to allow the light to enter and the smoke to escape. Inside, on both sides, broad platforms ran along the walls like the "sides of a colossal omnibus," at about four feet from the ground. In the summer these served as beds. The fires were upon the ground itself in a long line down the centre. Their numbers depended on the size of the cabin. In one eleven are mentioned. Each fire served for two families ranged one on each side and containing from five to ten members apiece. January to March were months of idleness, when they did not hunt, or fight, or trade. The cabins at this time swarmed with savages. Then it was that feasts, games, and dances succeeded one another without interruption, for they were as devoted to gambling as to gluttony. They wagered everything they had, ornaments, clothing, boats, pipes, arms, sometimes even their wives. "You

might have seen this winter," says the *Relation* of 1636, "a large troop of savages going off to their villages, after having lost their shoes in gambling, at a time when there was more than three feet of snow, and yet they were just as cheerful as if they had won." Like all the tribes of these parts, they offered a strange mixture of shameful vices and admirable qualities.

Their heart [says Père Rouvier]<sup>1</sup> was noble and base, a mixture of mud and gold. Hardened to fatigue from his youth, an adept at all deeds of boldness, the Huron threw himself without fear into dreadful solitudes or the most dangerous rapids: a mistake in the route in the one case, a false stroke with the paddle in the other, and his life would be forfeited. No matter. To expose himself to danger, to venture into the midst of cruel enemies or doubtful friends, to make his way for weeks and months through the woods or amid the mazes of lakes, rivers, waterfalls, and *portages*,<sup>2</sup> seemed a sport to him. Was luck against him? Whether he perished, frozen in the midst of a snowstorm, whether he succumbed in an unequal fight, or died horribly tortured by the Iroquois, he accepted his fate with a splendid resignation and singing loudly. But, returning to his village, he displayed all his vices. Incurably lazy, he remained whole days stretched at full length before the fire which warmed his cabin while filling it with smoke. A drunkard and a glutton, he delighted to intoxicate himself, and to devour quarters of venison. His improvidence was proverbial. Frank enough with his companions, he showed before strangers a treachery, a cunning, and a power of lying that were inexhaustible. As for thieving, "if you had as many eyes as fingers," wrote Père Le Jeune, "you would not prevent his stealing, for he steals with his feet." He practised hospitality, yet he had no pity for his sick or old people, whom he put to death as much to deliver them from their sufferings as to spare himself the trouble of looking after them. You can then understand what his enemies had to expect from him—an implacable ferocity. To sum up, a man to resist fatigue, a hero to face pain and death without flinching, the Huron was at the same time a child, but a vicious and corrupted child. He was born, lived, and died in a liberty absolutely unrestrained. In his eyes it was folly to subdue his passions and the highest wisdom to abandon himself to them.

Decency and cleanliness were, as might be expected, unknown qualities.

One of them [says Père Daniel], leaving our cabin for a time, came back and asked me for my cloak, because it was cold, he said, as if I had a dispensation from the laws of cold! I lent it to him however. Having used it for more than a month, he returned it to me so abominably dirty that I was ashamed of it.

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 61, 62.

<sup>2</sup> Places where canoes had to be carried to avoid rapids.

The Father goes on to tell how having displayed his cloak, as a mute reproach, before the eyes of the savage, he found the latter quite annoyed, and drew upon himself the following answer: "You say you wish to be a savage like us. If that is the case, do not be ashamed to wear the clothes of one, for ours are just like that." The good missionary found the answer so much to the point, that he folded up his cloak without a word.<sup>1</sup> The Hurons were keen traders, and used every year to come down to Quebec or Three Rivers to exchange their furs and tobacco for kettles, hatchets, knives, beads, shirts, &c. Parkman gives the following programme:<sup>2</sup> "On the first day the Indians built their huts, on the second, they held their council with the French officers at the fort; the third and fourth were devoted to business; on the fifth they were feasted by the French; and at daybreak of the next morning they embarked and vanished like a flight of birds."<sup>3</sup> Such were the people among whom the Jesuit Fathers laboured.

It was on their return journeys that they took the missionaries with them—if they could be induced to take them at all. Thus, in the summer of 1634, Fathers Brébeuf, Daniel, and Davost, after a year's waiting (for in the previous summer the Indians refused to take them at the last moment), returned with the Hurons. Brébeuf had already spent three years with them, 1626—1629, and before that had been among the Algonquins. Père Rouvier therefore justly calls him the founder of the Huron mission. He spent the rest of his life among them, for his martyrdom coincided almost with the destruction of the Huron nation. The journey in canoes of eight or nine hundred miles, up the rivers St. Lawrence and Ottawa, through Lake Nipissing and along the coast of the Georgian Bay, had its own difficulties and dangers. The Jesuits had of course to take their share of paddling and carrying the canoes when that was necessary, because of rapids. Sometimes these *portages* occurred as often as fifteen times in a day. Some were a mile long or even more. They were obliged in every way to conform themselves to the customs of the Indians, who for the merest whim would put them ashore or throw them overboard. Parkman sets out a remarkable document, drawn up and printed by the Jesuits in Paris for the guidance of missionaries travelling with Indians, which is too instructive to be omitted here.

<sup>1</sup> Rouvier, p. 283.

<sup>2</sup> *The Jesuits in North America*, p. 47.

<sup>3</sup> "Comme une volée d'oiseaux," says Père Le Jeune.

You should love the Indians like brothers, with whom you are to spend the rest of your life. Never make them wait for you in embarking. Take a flint and steel to light their pipes and kindle their fire at night; for these little services win their hearts. Try to eat their sagamite<sup>1</sup> as they cook it, bad and dirty as it is. Fasten up the skirts of your cassock, that you may not carry water or sand into the canoe. Wear no shoes or stockings in the canoe; but you may put them on in crossing the *portages*. Do not make yourself troublesome, even to a single Indian. Do not ask them too many questions. Bear their faults in silence, and appear always cheerful. Buy fish for them from the tribes you will pass; and for this purpose take with you some awls, beads, knives, and fish-hooks. Be not ceremonious with the Indians; take at once what they offer you: ceremony offends them. Be very careful, when in the canoe, that the brim of your hat does not annoy them. Perhaps it would be better to wear your nightcap. There is no such thing as impropriety among Indians. Remember that it is Christ and His Cross that you are seeking; and if you aim at anything else, you will get nothing but affliction for body and mind.<sup>2</sup>

With this it is amusing to compare what Schoolcraft<sup>3</sup> tells us of Hudson's arrival in America. "When Hendrick Hudson was received by the Indian tribe with whom he came in contact on landing, his first act was to intoxicate them all with whiskey, which they drank with repugnance, and only to show, by an admirable courtesy, their confidence in their new visitors." Their provisions, *en route*, often depended on the discovery of the meal which they had hidden at intervals of two days' journey on their way down. Even if they were successful in their search, it was no grand cheer. "In the morning," says Père Le Jeune, "they steep a little meal in water, and each eats about a plateful. Thereupon they ply the paddle all day, and at night eat as in the morning. This is the life our Fathers have to lead, until they reach their destination."<sup>4</sup> But beside the perils by water, all along the banks of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa, their deadly enemies the Iroquois were lying in wait. They sprang up from nowhere and yet seemed to be everywhere. They carried on a war of extermination against the Hurons, and nearly destroyed the French settlements as well. They were well armed, too, having been supplied with arquebuses by the Dutch settlers at Fort Orange (Albany) on the Hudson

<sup>1</sup> A "mush" made of pounded Indian corn, boiled with scraps of smoked fish.

<sup>2</sup> Parkman, p. 54, n.

<sup>3</sup> *Historical and Statistical Information respecting the Indian Tribes of the United States*, part ii. p. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Rouvier, p. 271.



River. On the present occasion—the journey in 1634—the peculiarities of the Indians were displayed. Brébeuf arrived first. His Huron companions, leaving on the ground the missionary's modest baggage, left him to his own resources while they set out for their own villages. But he knew the spot well, and made his way to the nearest Huron village, where he was at once recognized. Davost's "protector" robbed him of some of his property, threw some into the river, and left him on Allumette Island among the Algonquins. He reached the Huron country in a state of destitution. Daniel, too, had been deserted by his escort, but found others who brought him on. Arrived among the Hurons, the Fathers built a cabin after the native fashion. The savages came in at all times, admiring the many contrivances of the French, and remained motionless for hours. How could they be got rid of? At length Père Brébeuf hit on a happy device. Their greatest admiration was for a clock which struck the hours. They considered it a living thing, and asked what it ate. As the last stroke of the hour sounded one of the Fathers would cry "stop," to the admiration of the company. "What does the Captain say?" was a frequent question; for by this title of honour they designated the clock. "When he strikes twelve times, he says, 'Hang on the kettle'; and when he strikes four times, he says, 'Get up, and go home.' Both interpretations were well remembered. At noon, visitors were never wanting, to share the Father's sagamite; but at the stroke of four, all rose and departed, leaving the missionaries for a time in peace."<sup>1</sup>

Parkman gives an interesting account of the Fathers' method of procedure.

While zealously labouring to perfect their knowledge of the language, they spared no pains to turn their present acquirements to account. Was man, woman, or child, sick or suffering, they were always at hand with assistance or relief; adding, as they saw opportunity, explanations of Christian doctrine, pictures of Heaven and Hell, and exhortations to embrace the faith. Their friendly offices did not cease here, but included matters widely different. The Hurons lived in constant fear of the Iroquois. At times the whole village population would fly to the woods for concealment, or take refuge in one of the neighbouring fortified towns, on the rumour of an approaching war party. The Jesuits promised them the aid of the four Frenchmen armed with arquebuses, who had come with them from Three Rivers. They advised the Hurons to make their palisade forts, not, as hitherto, in a

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, p. 61.



circular form, but rectangular, with small flanking towers at the corners for the arquebuse men. The Indians at once saw the value of the advice, and soon after began to act on it in the case of their great town of Ossossané, or Rochelle. At every opportunity the missionaries gathered together the children of the village at their house. On these occasions, Brébeuf, for greater solemnity, put on a surplice. First he chanted the *Pater noster*, translated by Father Daniel into Huron rhymes, the children chanting in their turn. Next he taught them the sign of the Cross; made them repeat the *Ave*, the *Credo*, and the Commandments; questioned them as to past instructions, gave them briefly a few new ones, and dismissed them with a present of two or three beads, raisins, or prunes. . . . At times, the elders of the people, the repositories of its ancient traditions, were induced to assemble at the house of the Jesuits, who explained to them the principal points of their doctrine, and invited them to a discussion. The auditors proved pliant to a fault, responding, "Good," or "That is true," to every proposition; but, when urged to adopt the faith which so readily met their approval, they had always the same reply. "It is good for the French; but we are another people, with different customs."<sup>1</sup>

Sometimes they propounded arguments not wanting in acuteness. The difficulties of the Fathers did not arise from any natural defect of understanding on the part of the Indians, but, as Parkman well says, from the "inert mass of pride, sensuality, indolence, and superstition in which the Devil lay entrenched as behind impregnable breastworks."<sup>2</sup> Père Lalemant gives the following specimen, in his *Relation* of 1640: At the height of the pestilence, a Huron said to one of the priests, "I see plainly that your God is angry with us because we will not believe and obey Him. Ihonatiria, where you first taught his word, is entirely ruined. Then you came here to Ossossané, and we would not listen; so Ossossané is ruined too. This year you have been all through our country, and found scarcely any who would do what God commands; therefore the pestilence is everywhere." After premisses so hopeful, the Fathers looked for a satisfactory conclusion; but the Indian proceeded: "My opinion is, that we ought to shut you out from all the houses, and stop our ears when you speak of God, so that we cannot hear. Then we shall not be guilty of rejecting the truth, and He will not punish us so cruelly." This argument is by no means confined to Indians, and is one of the oldest, and commonest, against the Catholic religion—and also one of the most effective. It is better, people say, not to know the light

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, pp. 62—64.

<sup>2</sup> P. 135.

than to sin against it when known. Granted : but this argument labours under the disadvantage that it can hardly be used by any one for his *own* benefit, for the application to oneself must nearly always imply wilful, and so inexcusable, ignorance. The Indian notions of Heaven were of course crude. "Why did you baptize that Iroquois?" asked one of the dying converts, speaking of a prisoner recently tortured ; "he will get to Heaven before us, and, when he sees us coming, he will drive us out."<sup>1</sup>

Parkman admits the extraordinary success of the "Robes-Noires" among the Indians. Père Le Jeune spent the winter of 1633 with a band of Montagnais among the forests on the boundary of Maine. Ten years later Père Druilletes made a similar excursion, but with one essential difference.

Le Jeune's companions were heathen, who persecuted him day and night with their gibes and sarcasms. Those of Druilletes were all converts, who looked on him as a friend and a father. They built their bark chapel at every camp, and no festival of the Church passed unobserved. On Good Friday they laid their best robe of beaver-skin on the snow, placed on it a crucifix, and knelt around it in prayer. What was their prayer? It was a petition for the forgiveness and the conversion of their enemies the Iroquois. Those who know the intensity and tenacity of an Indian's hatred will see in this something more than a change from one superstition to another. An idea had been presented to the mind of the savage, to which he had previously been an utter stranger.<sup>2</sup>

The historian is kind enough to add, "This is far from being the only evidence, that, in teaching the dogmas and observances of the Roman Church, the missionaries taught also the morals of Christianity." Strange that so acute an observer does not see that it was *because* they practised and taught the morals of Christianity that they led the Indians to embrace its dogmas. In missions the morals will attract first in order of time, though they are not first in order of thought. Undogmatic religion, which many people are so fond of extolling, is simply a contradiction in terms. When the Hurons had perished as a nation, a small band who had joined the Iroquois held so fast to their faith, that, eighteen years after, a Jesuit missionary found that many of them were still good Catholics. If they had known Virgil, they might have apostrophized the martyrs as those

Egregias animas, quæ sanguine nobis  
Hanc patriam peperere suo,

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, p. 89.

<sup>2</sup> Parkman, pp. 318, 319.

"Illustrious souls who by their blood have gained this country (of Heaven) for us."

We have seen that while Parkman is fair in his statements of facts, his *ŋθος*, or attitude, is distinctly hostile to the Jesuits. He explains everything in the orthodox Protestant fashion. He is surprised that such visionaries, as he calls the Fathers, should yet be so practical in nursing, in building, in teaching, in all mundane matters. But to a Catholic it is nothing strange that those who have applied common-sense to the consideration of the next world, should also apply it to the affairs of this. The wonder would be if it were not so. He goes on: "In these enthusiasts we shall find striking examples of one of the morbid forces of human nature; yet in candour let us do honour to what was genuine in them—that principle of self-abnegation which is the life of true religion, and which is vital no less to the highest forms of heroism."<sup>1</sup> No doubt, *Verus profectus hominis est abnegatio sui ipsius*—"The true progress of man consists in denying himself," and yet this is closely connected with one of the morbid forces of human nature! What a splendid epithet is "morbid," how unanswerable it is, how it calmly chokes off all enthusiasm! The Apostles, we read, rejoiced that they were "considered worthy to suffer shame for His name;" admirable of course, but how morbid! The early Christians preferred to die rather than to burn incense to heathen gods; admirable again, but dreadfully morbid! If it were not for the mighty prescription that still protects the name of Jesus Christ, the same reasoning might have led an historian to call Him, what Mr. W. T. Stead has actually called Him, "the wandering eccentric from Nazareth." [By the way, does not this phrase, as applied to our Lord, exhibit the very acme of human conceit?] But without this "morbidness," what would have become of Christianity? And what should we be at the present moment? Christianity would have been merely one among the philosophies of the day, and, like them, would have declined and perished in the stress and friction of life. To convert others, it is necessary first of all to convince them of your own sincerity and devotion, and to convince them of this, it is necessary to *be* really sincere and devoted. It is impossible to keep up a deception before those with whom one's daily life is spent. The false article can be detected as readily by the untutored savage as by the civilized European. The Jesuit Fathers succeeded

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, p. 109.

because they were prepared to suffer torture and death for their religion, and they actually did so suffer when the time of trial came. Their secret, if it can be so called, was absolute humility, absolute faith, absolute devotion. No doubt, at the same time, immense graces were bestowed upon them, for the same fortitude was found in all, no matter what their natural dispositions.

It was impossible for the Indians not to contrast this apostolic zeal of the Jesuit missionaries with the self-interested behaviour of the Protestants, who came among them about the same time. The following speech of an Indian chief sums up, not unfairly, the experiences of Catholics and Protestants respectively which his people had received. When the English Governor of Boston, striving to alienate the natives from the French, made the Indians enticing offers, on condition that they would consent to admit an "English minister," he received the following answer from the orator deputed to speak on their behalf:

Your speech astonishes me. I am amazed at your proposal. You saw me long before the French did; yet neither you, nor your ministers, ever spoke to me of prayer or of the Great Spirit. They saw my furs and my beaver-skins, and they thought of them only. These were what they sought. When I brought them many, I was their great friend. That was all. On the contrary, one day I lost my way in my canoe, and arrived at last at an Algonquin village, near Quebec, where the Black Robes taught. I had hardly arrived, when a Black Robe came to see me. I was loaded with peltries [furs]. The French Black Robe disdained even to look at them. He spoke to me at once of the Great Spirit, of Paradise, of Hell, and of the prayer which is the only path to Heaven. I heard him with pleasure. I stayed long in the village to listen to him. At length prayer was pleasing to me. I begged him to instruct me. I asked for Baptism, and I received it. Then I returned to my own country, and told what had happened to me. They envied my happiness, and wished to share it. They set out to find the Black Robe, and ask him to baptize them. This is how the French behaved to us. If when you first saw me, you had spoken to me of prayer, I should have had the misfortune to learn to pray like you, for I was not then able to find out if your prayer was good. But I have learned the prayer of the French. I love it, and will follow it till the earth is consumed, and comes to an end. Keep, then, your money and your minister. I speak to you no more.<sup>1</sup>

It is not surprising that the Protestant settlers hated and feared the influence of the Jesuits, and that consequently the

<sup>1</sup> Marshall's *Christian Missions*, vol. iii. pp. 246, 247.

Legislature of Massachussetts enacted, in 1647, that Jesuits entering the colony should be expelled, and, if they returned, hanged.

Nor were the Jesuit Fathers prepared only to die for the Gospel. They were prepared to do what is much harder, not to choose their own time for dying, but to live as long as they could do service to God by living, and to wait for their death till the time when it should please Him, and not themselves. It was this feeling that led Père Jogues to effect his escape to Europe, and return again, though he would have preferred, if it depended on himself alone, to have given his life at once. It was this feeling (directed to a lower object), that we admire in the Romans of the early Republic, when they displayed unbounded devotion to the State. Thus, when the Roman army was entrapped in the Caudine Forks, the natural impulse of the soldiers was, not to survive their disgrace, but to die in a desperate struggle with the Samnites. But, as we read in Livy,<sup>1</sup> Lentulus, one of the officers, pointed out to them that such conduct would ruin Rome, by destroying her army. "A surrender, it is true, is shameful and ignominious; but such ought to be our affection for our country, that we ought to save it by our own disgrace, if need be, as freely as by our death." "We are not ignorant," wrote Père Le Mercier, on leaving Notre Dame des Anges (near Quebec), "that these savages have their hands and their lips still stained with the blood of our martyrs. But if the Apostles had consented to trust themselves among the heathen only when they had assurance that their lives were safe, they would not have lived up to the glorious name of Apostles."<sup>2</sup>

In 1648, five Jesuit Fathers left Three Rivers for the Huron mission:

These new soldiers of the Cross [says Père Rouvier] knew well the peril that confronted them. If they had not known it, a glance at Père Bressani would have taught them: his fingers cut off, his gashed hands bore the ineffaceable marks of the Iroquois cruelty. But these mutilated members also testified in favour of Jesus Christ. "Show us your scars," said a Huron to a confessor of the faith come back to them, "they tell us better than you can yourself that we ought to obey your God." "These crushed fingers," said another, "convert me. The Black Robe must believe firmly in what he teaches us, since after suffering so much for our sakes he gladly returns again to instruct and baptize us."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bk. ix. c. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Rouvier, p. 327.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 162.

What then had been the history of Père Bressani? It may perhaps be allowed just once to describe some of the tortures inflicted on him, as a specimen of all. In 1644, Bressani, an Italian Jesuit, now for two years past a missionary in Canada, was ordered to go up to the Huron country. While they were still on the St. Lawrence, a party of Iroquois captured them and carried them up the River Richelieu to their own country. Bressani afterwards wrote to the General at Rome a modest account of his sufferings. "The letter," he says, "is soiled and ill-written; because the writer has only one finger of his right hand left entire, and cannot prevent the blood from his wounds, which are still open, from staining the paper. His ink is gunpowder mixed with water, and his table is the earth." Then follows his narrative, the substance of which Parkman gives as follows:

On the Upper Hudson they found a fishing-camp of four hundred Iroquois, and now Bressani's torments began in earnest. They split his hand with a knife, between the little finger and the ring finger; then beat him with sticks, till he was covered with blood; and afterwards placed him on one of their torture-scaffolds of bark, as a spectacle to the crowd. Here they stripped him, and while he shivered with cold from head to foot, they forced him to sing. After about two hours they gave him up to the children, who ordered him to dance, at the same time thrusting sharpened sticks into his flesh, and pulling out his hair and beard. "Sing!" cried one. "Hold your tongue!" screamed another; and if he obeyed the first, the second burned him. "We will burn you to death; we will eat you." "I will eat one of your hands." "And I will eat one of your feet." These scenes were renewed every night for a week. Every evening a chief cried aloud through the camp, "Come, my children, come and caress our prisoners!" and the savage crew thronged jubilant to a large hut, where the captives lay. They stripped off the torn fragment of a cassock, which was the priest's only garment; burned him with live coals and red-hot stones; forced him to walk on hot cinders; burned off now a finger-nail and now the joint of a finger—rarely more than one at a time, however, for they economized their pleasures, and reserved the rest for another day. This torture was prolonged till one or two o'clock, after which they left him on the ground, fast bound to four stakes, and covered only with a scanty fragment of deer-skin.<sup>1</sup>

It is often charged against the Jesuits that they cared nothing at all for the body, and therefore regarded the sufferings whether of themselves or of others with equanimity. Parkman even allows himself to say that they regarded with composure the

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, pp. 253, 254.



tortures inflicted by the Hurons on an Iroquois prisoner, provided they had baptized him. "His eternal bliss secure, all else was as nothing." Again, the Jesuits "were wholly given to the saving of souls, and held the body in scorn, as the vile source of incalculable mischief, worthy the worst inflictions that could be put upon it." Or again, of an Iroquois prisoner who was executed after being tortured: "The Fathers could not save his life, but, what was more to the purpose, they baptized him."<sup>1</sup> Such language is meant to raise prejudice. The Fathers did what they could. If they could not save life as well as baptize, they need not give up both. They were themselves, of course, as sensitive to pain as others, and that they did not care for the suffering of others is amply refuted by their devotion in nursing, in curing the sick, in visiting plague-stricken natives whom none of their own people would approach, and in various other ways. This calumny is just one of these half-truths which are so much more wicked than downright lies, inasmuch as they are more difficult to expose. It is, in fact, precisely the lie of the false witness who testified that Christ forbade paying tribute to Cæsar.

Père Rouvier gives biographical accounts of five of the Fathers, viz., Brébeuf, Gabriel Lalemant, Jogues, Daniel, and Charles Garnier. We need not linger long on them. Each life shows the same record of unwearied devotion to Christ and His Cross, followed in due course by martyrdom. Brébeuf is the most striking figure. He is the protagonist of the tragedy both with Parkman and Père Rouvier. He was a man of iron frame and unconquerable resolution. When the Iroquois destroyed the Huron town of St. Louis, in March, 1649, he and Lalemant were led back by the conquerors to St. Ignace for torture and execution. Many times before had they expected this even from the hands of the Hurons, for whenever a pestilence invaded the district, it was attributed to the sorceries of the Jesuits, but they had always escaped till now, probably owing to their undaunted mien. The tortures they underwent are too sickening to be detailed. Fire played the chief part. One thing the Iroquois did, was to pour boiling water over them in mockery of Baptism. Brébeuf especially enraged them because they could not draw from him any sign of pain. This was considered a bad omen for the torturers. As long as he could speak he exhorted his Huron disciples to

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, pp. 81, 351, 338.



stand firm. His agony lasted for three hours, till a young chief, growing tired, plunged a knife into his body and plucked out his heart. "Thus," writes Parkman, with noble appreciation, "died Jean de Brébeuf, the founder of the Huron mission, its truest hero, and its greatest martyr. He came of a noble race—the same, it is said, from which sprang the English Earls of Arundel; but never had the mailed barons of his line confronted a fate so appalling, with so prodigious a constancy. To the last he refused to flinch, and his death was the astonishment of his murderers."<sup>1</sup> Lalemant was a man of much less bodily strength.<sup>2</sup> With a diabolical refinement of cruelty his executioners led him forth to witness the torture of Brébeuf, hoping thus to weaken his constancy. However, he dragged himself to the feet of Brébeuf to ask his blessing. Lalemant's martyrdom actually lasted for seventeen hours, a night intervening, for it was an Iroquois custom that a condemned man should not die between sunset and sunrise. During the night he was abandoned to the caprices of the children. Daniel laboured among the Hurons for fourteen years. At length he fell murdered in his church at St. Joseph during an attack of the Iroquois. "Seeing the priest advance alone and unarmed to meet them, they were struck with amazement. Victim and murderers remained a moment face to face, motionless; the savages, however, soon recovered themselves and their ferocity. But, still kept at a distance by some feeling of awe, it was by arrows at first and afterwards by an arquebus that they laid low on the earth the servant of God (July 4, 1648)."<sup>3</sup>

Garnier arrived much later than the others. He had had great difficulty in being allowed to lead a religious life, owing to the opposition of his family. "With none of the bone and sinew of rugged manhood," says Parkman,<sup>4</sup> "he entered, not only without hesitation, but with eagerness, on a life which would have tried the boldest; and, sustained by the spirit within him, he was more than equal to it." It was in December, 1649, that he met his death, when the Hurons themselves, as a nation, were in their last extremity. He was at St. Jean when the Iroquois attacked it. Père Rouvier<sup>5</sup> thus describes his last moments:

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, pp. 389, 390.

<sup>2</sup> "C'était," said the Ven. Mère Marie de l'Incarnation, "l'homme le plus faible et le plus délicat qu'on pût voir."

<sup>3</sup> Rouvier, p. 303.

<sup>4</sup> P. 100. <sup>5</sup> P. 346.

At the time of the Iroquois attack, the missionary was visiting the cabins of some neophytes. It was with his hand raised to pour the water of Baptism upon these heathen brows, that he was struck down. A first ball hit him in the breast, a second, almost immediately afterwards, in the groin. Horrible as these wounds were, they did not abate his courage. His hands joined together, the victim prayed calmly; perhaps he was making the supreme offering to his crucified God. . . . Having finished this prayer, Père Garnier turned his head and perceived, a dozen steps ahead, an unfortunate man in the agony of death. Then in his apostle's heart so intense a love for souls awoke, that he seemed on the point of overcoming death itself. The martyr got upon his knees, and rising with pain, moved towards the dying man. But, at the third step, he fell heavily to the ground. Caring nothing for his exhaustion, again he got upon his knees and stood up; a second time he fell. In this splendid and touching struggle of love against death, love would no doubt have gained the victory in the end, had not an Iroquois hatchet descended on his head, and, splitting his skull, assured to the athlete the immortal palm which for thirty years he had been soliciting from God.

Of all their deaths we may use the sacred writer's words, quoted prophetically by Lalemant to Brébeuf at their martyrdom: "Brother, we are made a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men."

The life of Père Jogues, the model of patience, was more diversified. Once, going up to the Huron country, he was captured by the Iroquois, and was their prisoner for thirteen months, during which time he was often tortured. "With all his gentleness, he had a certain warmth or vivacity of temperament. . . . While submitting to every caprice of his tyrants, and appearing to rejoice in abasement, a derisive word against his faith would change the lamb into a lion, and the lips that seemed so tame would speak in sharp, bold tones of menace and reproof."<sup>1</sup> The Mohawks carried him down Lake Champlain, then past the spot where the bloody massacre of Ticonderoga took place more than a hundred years later, then to Lake George. From here, during a visit of some Indians, with whom he was travelling, to Fort Orange, he escaped to Europe by the aid of the Dutch. The account of his arrival at the Jesuit College at Rennes, on January 5, 1644, is dramatic. The porter took him at first for a beggar, but, on the traveller insisting, he went to inform the Superior. The latter was preparing to celebrate Mass, but immediately went to meet him. Without reading the letter which Jogues handed to him, the Rector questioned him upon Canadian affairs, and at length asked him

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, p. 305.

if he knew Père Jogues, whose hard captivity was known all over France through the *Relations*. "I knew him intimately, Reverend Father." "Well, can you give us any news about him? Is he still alive? or, as it is said, has he been burned by the Iroquois?" "No, Father, he lives, it is he who speaks to you, and at this moment asks your blessing." He only remained three months in Europe. On his return to Quebec he was sent by the Superior as an ambassador to the Iroquois, with whom he had so lately been a prisoner. The Iroquois and the French had come to terms, and the French had given up some Iroquois prisoners. In July, 1645, these liberated Iroquois reappeared at Three Rivers, accompanied by Mohawk orators and a Frenchman named Couture, who had been made prisoner with Jogues, and long since given up as dead. The Father accomplished his mission satisfactorily, and after that resolved to continue his apostleship among them once more. This time he foreboded his end. *Ibo*, he said, *et non redibo*—"I shall go and shall not return," and soon after his arrival among them he was treacherously murdered by a young chief while entering a tent.

All these we have mentioned met violent deaths, but the end of Père Anne de Noué was equally a martyrdom. He was an old priest of sixty-three years of age, and had been more than twenty years in Canada. He started on January 30, 1646, from Three Rivers to go to Fort Richelieu, where he was to say Mass and hear confessions. The distance was not more than thirty miles, and he was accompanied by two soldiers and a Huron Indian. Their route was on the St. Lawrence, now solid ice, and buried under two or three feet of snow. The soldiers were much fatigued the first day, and, waking up in the middle of the night, the Father had the kindly thought of going on in advance to Fort Richelieu and sending back some men to aid with the luggage. He knew the way well, so took no food or blanket with him, not doubting he should reach his destination before night. Unfortunately before dawn the weather changed and a snow-storm set in. The traveller lost his way and wandered in the snow all that day and the next. Meantime the Indian and the soldiers had made their way to Fort Richelieu, not doubting that they would find Père Noué already arrived. All one day they searched for him in vain. On the next morning, February 2nd, the Indian traced his footsteps.

He had passed near the fort without discovering it—perhaps weakness had dimmed his sight, stopped to rest at a point a league

above, and thence made his way about three leagues farther. Here they found him. He had dug a circular excavation in the snow, and was kneeling in it on the earth. His head was bare, his eyes open and turned upwards, and his hands clasped on his breast. His hat and his snow-shoes lay at his side. The body was leaning slightly forward, resting against the bank of snow before it, and frozen to the hardness of marble. Thus, in an act of kindness and charity, died the first martyr of the Canadian Mission.<sup>1</sup>

The Huron mission is a glorious memory, but it has been called a failure. Certainly it was a material failure, simply because the Huron nation ceased to exist, but in no other sense. "The cause of the failure of the Jesuits," says Parkman,<sup>2</sup> "is obvious. The guns and tomahawks of the Iroquois were the ruin of their hopes. Could they have curbed or converted those ferocious bands, it is little less than certain that their dream would have become a reality. . . The swift decline of the Indian population would have been arrested; and it would have been made, through the fur trade, a source of prosperity to New France." The Hurons were finally overwhelmed by the Iroquois in 1650, and their small remnants scattered in different directions. Some joined the Iroquois, being adopted into their tribes. Others settled near Quebec, where a few of their descendants may still be found with the Indian blood nearly bleached out of them. But the short-sighted ferocity of the Iroquois led to their own destruction in no long time. Reduced so enormously in number, they became no match for the English and Dutch settlers, who killed them off as much by the introduction of intoxicating drink as by war. "Liberty," says Parkman—with a big L—"may thank the Iroquois, that by their insensate fury the plans of her adversary were brought to nought, and a peril and a woe averted from her future." O Liberty, what nonsense is written in thy name! As if the constitution of the United States were the high-water mark yet reached by Providence. The providence of God, he adds, seemed to the Jesuits dark and inexplicable; but from the standpoint of Liberty, that providence is clear as the sun at noon. Parkman is evidently on familiar terms with the designs of Providence, so we must leave him to his comfortable theories. One thing may be said. Too often, in human affairs, we cannot see the working out of principles to their conclusion, because the threads of life cross and re-cross so often, that the legitimate results of actions are obscured, and one principle thwarts another principle. But the history of the

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, p. 260.

<sup>2</sup> P. 447.

Huron mission is interesting on this account, that here, as in a well-constructed play, we can and do see the working out of principles, in a limited sphere, and on a small scale, and, judged from this point of view, we find in it a splendid testimony to the Divine origin of Christianity.

It must not be lost sight of too that the early Jesuits were great explorers. Brébeuf, in 1640, saw the Falls of Niagara and traversed Lake Erie. In 1660, Mesnard passed the Falls of Ste. Marie, between Lakes Huron and Superior, and explored the shores of the last-named lake. Allouez penetrated to Lake Michigan and beyond. In 1673, Allouez and Marquette embarked on the upper waters of the Mississippi.<sup>1</sup> The statue of Marquette has been erected in Washington by the State of Wisconsin, as that of its founder.

It is only the other day that the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster delivered a farewell address to the four missionaries appointed by the Holy See to go out to Uganda under Bishop Hanlon. We cannot better conclude than by quoting a few of his words: "In all probability [he said] their brethren would never see the faces of the missionaries again, for, in all probability, they would become either the victims of the savagery of wild tribes or of the deadly climate to which they were going. God now made His choice for them, and they were going forth in His name. With sufferings of all kinds were the missionaries to be clothed as with a garment. Yet whence the joy to be seen on their faces that afternoon? What was the source of their hope and their faith? If men wanted to know the secret which filled their hearts with joy, they would find that the motive was none other than love for our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. They were going forth to represent His will to the nations that knew it not—to make Him known and loved among those who were sitting in darkness and in alienation of soul from their Supreme Good. Sweet words of tender affection poured out before the tabernacle were not proof of love for God; sentimental feelings of joy, consolation, and peace in the service of God, were not sufficient proof that men really loved Him. The proof of love for Jesus Christ in the hearts of His Apostles was that they should go forth and should suffer, and that they should give themselves, their blood, and their life, if need be, in the service of Him who filled their hearts with love."

S. C. RICHARDS.

<sup>1</sup> Reclus, *Nouvelle Géographie universelle*, vol. xv. pp. 46, 47.

## Reviews.

---

### I.—THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.<sup>1</sup>

THE idea of *Some Side-Lights on the Oxford Movement* is to illustrate by the experiences of an individual life "the influence of Tractarian principles on some of that comparatively insignificant, but not wholly unimportant, section of the community—the Young Ladies of England." The writer was passing through her childhood and youth in the fifties, a thrilling period when the principles of the Tractarian movement were being earnestly discussed in religious circles, and the interest in them was quickened at short intervals by the conversions, one after another, of men in whose zeal and talents the hopes of the Tractarian party were centred. Moving in a society where these discussions were rife, the authoress soon began to realize their supreme importance. God was gradually manifesting His truth to her young mind, and she gave herself to the inquiry with candour and earnestness, and with a singularly clear judgment. At the early age of twelve she for the first time entered a Catholic church—the little church of Woodchester, then under the care of the Passionists—and the experience affected her as it has affected so many. "There was a sense of longing satisfied." Some might be inclined to smile at a declaration of this kind from one so young, or to set it down as an illustration of the kind of unsatisfactory emotionalism to which the Catholic Church addresses her most successful appeals. But, on the other hand, the power of a religion to meet the instincts of a child's heart is not the least valuable of its tests, and, at all events in the present case, the conversion did not follow till many years had intervened, and the reasons on either side had been calmly weighed under a deep sense of responsibility, as the whole tenor of the book testifies. Indeed, what makes personal records like these so particularly useful at the

<sup>1</sup> *Some Side-Lights on the Oxford Movement*. London: Art and Book Company, 1895.



present time, is that they reveal to us the real workings of mind and heart which lead into the Catholic Church, and show how different they are from what the popular notion so confidently imagines.

Allusion has been made to the youth of the writer at the time when she was debating within herself these deep questions, but there are her letters to witness to the reality of her reflections, nor does the writer herself appear to have been the only youthful thinker displaying these elevated interests. Young ladies of the present day will do well to take note of their own declension from the high thoughts of their kind half a century ago.

The Gorham controversy was amongst the first of the much debated questions to attract their notice. The clergyman under whom she sat on Sundays "could read the baptismal service with much unction and emphasis, and give thanks to Almighty God that He had been pleased to regenerate this infant," and then tell the congregation from the pulpit that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration was a Popish superstition. This set the young minds agog, and they betook themselves to their Bibles—only to discover the impracticability of the Anglican doctrinal test, that nothing is required to be believed which cannot be found in Scripture or proved thereby. The lesson was not lost. Soon came another perplexity over the doctrine of self-imposed mortifications, Dr. Pusey and the *Tracts for the Times* insisting that without them "they could not be our Lord's true disciples," and Dr. Magee that with them "they were going their own way to salvation," and would be asked at the Last Day, "Who hath required this at your hands?" Then there was the difficult question whether Mr. Bennett, then of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, did right or not in not submitting at once to his Bishop; and the Papal Aggression outcry, following so fast on the Gorham controversy, caused them to reflect that "if the Church of England did not proclaim her faith in Baptism because she had no power of making her voice heard, she found power of voice to pronounce judgment against Papal Supremacy." Similar perplexities through the contradictions of Anglican teaching arose one after the other, forcing on these young thinkers the conviction that something was wrong in their religious system, and, co-operating with some Anglicanized Catholic books of devotion, to turn their gaze towards the Catholic Faith, an exponent of which they had occasionally



found in a certain Father Honorius. Later on the writer and her family came to know Mr. Aubrey de Vere, many of whose letters are given, and to whose instructions, under God, she appears to have been chiefly indebted for her conversion. Through him the fundamental question of a Divine Teacher, and of Papal Supremacy, were brought under notice, with the searching elucidation of many difficulties. A visit to his Irish home, her first visit to a Catholic house, is referred to as an important epoch in her religious history. She also came much into contact with the future Cardinal Manning, both before and after his conversion, and for a shorter time with Robert Isaac Wilberforce, who by his books and his conversation seems, above all others, to have impressed her. A lengthened visit to Italy and to Rome, with opportunities of studying Catholic life, came at the right time to supply what was necessary to clear away the mists, and to destroy all hesitations as to the duty of seeking admission into the Catholic Church.

It would carry us too far afield to give details of the reasonings through which the authoress passed, but we must allow ourselves just one extract, by way of specimen, to show how deep and how accurately she could carry her analysis. A colonial Bishop had asked her "whether it was not the height of presumption, a manifestation of self-conceit, to take upon ourselves to decide that we should be better elsewhere than in the Church of England, where Providence had ordained that we should be born." The following were her reflections on this plausible presentation of the case :

At first sight the Bishop's view certainly seemed to have humility to recommend it. On the other hand, to accept and act upon his view made the practice of humility difficult, if not impossible. Some people may rest content not to trouble themselves about doctrine at all. They hear one clergyman preach a doctrine and another preach the direct contradictory of that doctrine from the same pulpit on the same day. They think, or perhaps, not *thinking* at all, they act as if they thought both doctrines were equally in accordance with the mind of God. To those who do really reflect, such a view is impossible. They must make a choice. They are compelled to sit in judgment on their teachers. They must otherwise be prepared to change their beliefs to suit the parish in which they may find themselves. Consequently the position in which they are placed is not conducive to the growth of humility.

The authoress was not without her experiences of the amusing features of Anglican life. There was Mr. Sherwin,

who used to "enliven us with very curious notices interspersed up and down the service about blankets which were to be had on advantageous terms," and Mr. Sewell, whose maxim for "English Churchmen" was that they could always trust their conscience when it told them *not* to do a thing, and that they were therefore safe in listening to it when it said, "Thou shalt not leave the Church of England," but unsafe when it said, "Thou shalt join the Church of Rome."

---

## 2.—THE HISTORY OF THE POPES.<sup>1</sup>

The favourable impression made by the previous volumes of the English translation of Pastor's great work will have already bespoken a welcome for the two new volumes which are now in hand. A version from the German, so correct, and at the same time so little like a version in its smooth idiomatic style, is very creditable to the translators. What translations from the German are liable to be, if any one desires a test by which to estimate the value of the present work, can be learnt from T. and T. Clarke's Theological Series.

The third and fourth volumes of the English translation correspond with the second volume of the German original, of which the second edition is also lying on our table. This German edition is "much enlarged and improved," the author having availed himself of many further documents discovered or examined during the interval, of further contributions to his subject-matter by other pens, and of the criticism which his own work had received. A cursory inspection of the German volume shows that the additions have considerably enriched it. From a reviewer's point of view, however, regret must be expressed that at least some of the more important have not been indicated in the Preface. The feature which first attracts attention in this second edition is the Appendix. A certain Herr v. Drussel, an "Old Catholic," had published an attack on the *History of the Popes*, in which he had endeavoured in the most supercilious manner to convict the author of utter incompetency, and thereby

<sup>1</sup> (1) *The History of the Popes*, from the German of Dr. Ludwig Pastor. Edited by Frederick Ignatius Antrobus, of the Oratory. Vols. iii. iv. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co., 1894.

(2) *Geschichte der Päpste*. Von Dr. Ludwig Pastor. Zweiter Band Vielfach umbearbeitete und Verbesserte Auflage. Freiburg: Herder, 1894.

to divest his work of the reputation it had acquired. In the Appendix in question, originally published as a separate work, the author replies at great length to the censure, thoroughly demolishing his critic, and, what is of more interest to us, recording the favourable verdicts passed on his own impartiality of judgment, scientific method, and vast research, by men whose historical reputation stands at the highest.

The new English volumes deal with the Pontificates of Pius II., Paul II., and Sixtus IV.—a stirring period and one to understand the issues of which we particularly need the help of a Catholic historian like Dr. Pastor. The prominent questions at the time were the preservation of Christendom from the Turks, Ecclesiastical Reform, Humanism, and the Italian wars. The Eastern Question is an incubus upon the minds of modern European statesmen, and, if it is not still heavier, they would do well to remember that they owe this to the zeal and energy of the fifteenth and sixteenth century Popes, as also that we might be now free from the scandal altogether if the princes and statesmen had then listened to the Papal exhortations and had laid aside their wretched internecine quarrels to join in common action against the common enemy. To obtain this common action was the chief aim of Pius II., as it had been of his immediate predecessor. He saw the dominion of the Turk taking in one Christian province after another, and driving its inhabitants into slavery or apostasy, and he seemed to be the only man of his time to realize the urgent danger lest the whole of Christendom should soon be overrun. He raised his voice in appeal to the sovereigns, he sought to assemble them in a Congress at Mantua, he laboured to reconcile their disagreements, he entreated them to give, and to allow their subjects to give, alms for the Crusades, and he made heavy personal sacrifices himself. But it was all to no purpose. Very tragic and touching is the picture Dr. Pastor draws of this high-souled and energetic Pope dying on the shores of the Adriatic at the other side of which the enemy's standard was now erected, and hopelessly awaiting the arrival of the small aids that had been only too treacherously promised him. Paul II. likewise strove hard to make the sovereigns realize the importance even to their own national interests of united action, and he too, like his predecessor, made great personal sacrifices, when all extraneous aid failed him, to assist the Hungarians against whom the Turkish attack was at the time directed. Sixtus IV. took up the vain

endeavour and actually succeeded in equipping a fleet which achieved some partial successes, but he had the same difficulties to contend with in the paltry aims of the Italian princes, and the comparative relief from the danger during his reign was due not to the efforts of man, but to the hand of God, to the unexpected death of Mahomet II. in 1480.

The characters of these three Popes, which have been much attacked, must be drawn in light as well as shade, and Dr. Pastor is able to show that the light predominated. Pius II. (*Æneas Sylvius*) was a really grand Pope. Poet, historian, humourist, and historian, he was the master mind of his age. At the same time he was known for his piety, for the simplicity of his habits, his devotion to work, his patient bearing of suffering, and his amiability of temperament. The volume before us gives conclusive illustration of these virtues. Paul II. has suffered from the vindictive malice of Platina, whose account has so often been blindly accepted by historians. The estimate of the Chronicler of Viterbo Dr. Pastor takes to be much truer: "Pope Paul was a just, holy, and peaceable man; he established good government in all parts of his dominions." It is not true that he opposed Humanism, he only opposed the downright heathenism into which some of its votaries lapsed. Sixtus IV. is a more difficult character to gauge. The nepotism which gave to the Cardinalate Julian della Rovere may be readily forgiven him: but for having elevated his other and dissolute nephew, Pietro Riario, he is quite indefensible, and he made other similar worldly appointments which did much mischief to the Church, appointments which among other evils led up to the election of Alexander VI. Still Pastor judges that "an impartial study of history must lead us to protest against the picture drawn by Infessura of Sixtus IV." There is no solid ground for believing him to have been other than a religious-minded and moral man; nor was he chargeable with ambition or covetousness. His chief faults were due rather to his easy-going character and to the weakness which made him a tool in the hands of others. The grave charge against him of having instigated the assassination of the Medici by the Pazzi is satisfactorily disposed of by the testimony of Montesecco, one of the conspirators. He had, perhaps, exceeded the bounds of propriety in approving the removal of the Medici, as tyrants, from the government of Florence, but he had condemned in the most decided terms all attempts to take away their lives.

Another interesting point which Dr. Pastor makes clear is connected with the capitularies which in some fifteenth century conclaves the Cardinals were in the habit of drawing up and signing before proceeding to the election of a new Pope. By these signatures each bound himself to certain measures and conditions in the eventuality of the choice falling upon him. These stipulations restricted the free monarchical action of the Pontiff, and were in reality an assault upon the Divine constitution of the Church. Paul II., having accepted capitularies of this kind, almost immediately on his election refused to recognize their binding force, and has been charged with perjury in consequence. But Dr. Pastor is able to show us on what ground Pope Paul proceeded. He consulted a body of theologians, who advised him that it was impossible for a Pope to deprive himself of his divinely given plenitude of power, and that his previous signature could only commit him so far as his own better judgment accorded with what he had pledged himself to do.

---

### 3.—THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND.<sup>1</sup>

This second instalment of Miss Allies' *History of the Church in England* deals with a period which though short in duration was pregnant in results. It was the period during which the Old Religion was ejected not only from its material possessions, but from what it valued still more, the hearts of the English people; and when a brand-new State religion was manufactured to take its place. Much necessarily depends on the view taken of the process by which so momentous a substitution was effected. Was it an uprising of earnest minds against demoralizing abuses, and did it stop at the removal of abuses, while conscientiously endeavouring to preserve what was good and Catholic in the old system? Or was it not rather an outbreak of the spirit of self-seeking and lawlessness? The former view is the view traditional among the English people, but it is now generally recognized that in England as much as on the Continent, the so-called Reformation was a movement conducted by covetousness, lust, and tyranny, in alliance with fanaticism, and was imposed on the English people against their consciences, and in spite of their protests, by bitter and

<sup>1</sup> *The History of the Church in England. 1509—1603.* By Mary H. Allies. London: Burns and Oates; New York, &c.: Benziger.

persistent persecution. The facts which justify this adverse estimate of the character of the Reformation need to be widely known to English readers, and Miss Allies has set them forth in a popular and readable form.

The special merit of this volume is its grasp of the continuity by which the successive stages in the destroying movement were held together from the passion of Henry VIII. for Anne Boleyn to the death of Elizabeth. The passion for Anne Boleyn led to the repudiation of Papal Authority; the repudiation of Papal Authority to the Destruction of the Monasteries, the strongholds of Catholic loyalty; the Destruction of the Monasteries, by kindling the monarch's covetousness, led to the Destruction of Shrines and Chantries, and thence to the war against the Veneration of the Saints and the Sacrifice of the Mass; whilst the excesses consequent on the license given to Protestant fanaticism, led to the partial reaction of the Six Articles. Thus it was in the reign of Henry, and so it continued through the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, measure succeeding measure, and event succeeding event; each being the direct outcome of that which had preceded it. This sequence is not always sufficiently brought out by writers, but Miss Allies has brought it out distinctly and effectively, and in this respect has rendered her work particularly serviceable; for it is by studying the events thus in their sequence that we come to realize how thoroughly the underlying motive which caused the substitution of one Church for another, was not a high-minded zeal for Reformation, but the desire on the part of a few powerful people to gratify their worldly ambitions and lusts, at no matter what cost to truth and to the consciences of the people.

The authoress may likewise be commended for the success with which she has drawn her pictures. She has not confused her readers with a multiplicity of details, unsuitable in a popular work, but has confined herself to salient features, and has thus been enabled to convey distinct impressions.

---

#### 4—RELIGIOUS LIFE.<sup>1</sup>

It is a matter for just and common congratulation, that English Catholic literature has so much increased of late years.

<sup>1</sup> *Elements of Religious Life.* By Father Humphrey, S.J. London and Leamington: Art and Book Company, 1895.



Yet Father Humphrey has found and supplied a real want. We have many good books treating of the religious life from an ascetical point of view, but we have hardly a single practical yet simple guide to its constitutions, laws, and obligations. Father Humphrey's book forms an excellent handbook on these subjects, where accurate information is especially important. What persistent and painful misunderstandings have arisen from ill-formed ideas about such technical expressions as a "state of perfection," from ignorance of the true obligations of religious vows, and of the processes by which such obligations are incurred, and, to prevent a worse evil, relaxed. Father Humphrey handles all these questions with his usual precision and accuracy, and as he has aimed not at novelty, but at reproducing succinctly the great classic of Father Suarez on the subject, he has ensured a completeness and breadth of handling, together with an authority, which is sure to give the little work permanent value as a book of reference.

Wherever we open it we find passages of the character we have just described. Take the following on vocation :

Desire for the religious state is itself, as a rule, from the Holy Ghost, and this desire is to be entertained as coming from Him. The Holy Ghost may, however, cause the desire of a thing the accomplishment of which He does not will. He sometimes instils the desire, as a means of merit, even if the desire is never to be fulfilled, and even if it is not expedient that it should be fulfilled. Hence even if it is morally clear to a religious Superior that a particular person has been moved by the Holy Ghost to ask for the religious habit, he will nevertheless rightly refuse him, if it is not expedient for the Order that he should be received. In like manner, even if a man may himself morally believe that he is moved by the Holy Ghost to ask for the religious habit, he may nevertheless hesitate and take counsel. The desire is given for this end chiefly, that a man should deliberate, take counsel, and test his motives. (p. 69.)

How differently an ascetical writer would have treated the question, yet no treatment could be clearer and briefer than this. The English is excellent throughout, and a great relief after the Anglo-French, of which we read so much in other works of this class. Yet some phrases are not perfect. What is "the stability which is required in order to the idea of a state"? (p. 18.) What means "*moral belief*" in the extract above? These are details. Another omission seems to be made (p. 200), in treating of the *clausura* of religious missionaries without



taking notice of the effect of customs which have lasted *ab immemorabili*. If Father Humphrey had furnished his book with an Index as well as a Table of Contents, it would have been still more handy as a book of reference, and have shown to still better advantage the great variety of useful subjects discussed. We should like all who enter the religious state, or who advise others on this point, to familiarize themselves with this book. They would find in it intelligible solutions of many oft-recurring difficulties, and information which would frequently be useful.

---

#### 5.—THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Bulmer's idea in this little volume was originally to give a translation of Estius, an exegetical writer of the sixteenth century whose reputation stands high among Catholic commentators for soundness and sobriety of judgment, and who was on that account styled by Benedict XIV., the Doctor Fundatissimus. Estius, however, is somewhat diffuse, and besides there was no object in passing over the thoughts of other expositors when they seemed valuable, and so the work before us has taken its present form, consisting mainly, but not exclusively, of extracts from Estius, the author himself adding useful and reliable notes, for which his classical attainments well qualify him. The Greek text of each chapter is given first, and then follows the comment in which the force of the Greek terms is always, and rightly, estimated, but not in too obtrusive a manner.

There is not, unfortunately, as much interest as one could wish, taken in this sort of reading by English Catholics. Priests are hard worked in other ways, and laymen yield to the tastes of the day which incline to a very different kind of reading. But those who desire some trustworthy assistance to follow the thoughts of St. Paul, will find their requirements met by Mr. Bulmer's little volume. It will not cumber them with too much, nor draw off their attention from the profitable study of the text to bewildering speculations of higher criticism, but it will enable them to realize the wealth and suggestiveness of St. Paul's ideas. In this respect the Epistle to Titus is happily chosen by the writer for his first venture. Its main

<sup>1</sup> *St. Paul's Epistle to Titus*. By John Bulmer, B.D., Mus. Bac. London: C. M. Rock; Durham: Messrs. Andrews and Co.

theme is the delineation of the Christian character, the working out, we may say, into detail, of that image of Christ which His followers are bidden to reproduce in themselves. In carrying out this plan we notice at the first glance how in such an Epistle as this, St. Paul multiplies his terms, but a good commentator reveals to us how much is contained in each of them, and with what accuracy and richness of conception they all combine to complete the picture. We have not much room for extracts, but one very short extract will illustrate this characteristic of the Apostle's writing as well as the style of Mr. Bulmer's commentary. On Titus ii. 2, where St. Paul enjoins that "the old men be sober, chaste, prudent, sound in faith, in love, in patience," the author annotates thus:

νηφαλίους: sober; not in the more general sense of the term, but (according to Estius) to be strictly taken.—σεμνοῦς. The best rendering seems to be "grave."—σώφρονας: A word which (as observed at i. 8) admits sundry shades of meaning. Estius writes on the Vulgate rendering here: "*Prudentes*, Græcè *σώφρονας*, which others render 'temperate;' that is, conducting themselves in every action with prudence and moderation." It may be observed that the primary meaning of *σωφρονίη* is "sound-mindedness," and that it soon came to mean "temperance in regard to pleasures,"—*μεσότης περὶ ἡδονάς*, as defined by Aristotle. (See *Nic. Eth.* iii. 10.)—πίστει, ἀγαπῇ, ὑπομονῇ: These are found similarly conjoined, in an enumeration of graces to be followed after, in 1 Tim. vi. 11. "There are here signified," says Estius, "the three principal virtues of Christians, faith, charity, and hope; from which latter patience derives its strength; whence the designation, "patience of hope," in 1 Thess. i. 3.

---

6.—THE WORLD'S OWN BOOK; OR, THE TREASURY OF  
À KEMPIS.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Percy Fitzgerald adds one more to the list of little spiritual books with which he has been lately providing us. These little works have a special character of their own among spiritual books, which is not easy to define but is really pleasing. The name given to one of them, *Words for the Worldly*, would not of course be a suitable title for a book on à Kempis, but it would describe one kind of usefulness which the book before us may have, that of attracting the worldly-minded to its

<sup>1</sup> *The World's own Book; or, The Treasury of à Kempis.* By Percy Fitzgerald, M.A., F.S.A. London: Elliot Stock.

pages by revealing to them its human interest. Nor is this an attraction which can address its appeal to the worldly-minded only. It is pleasing to us all to discover the literary and psychological interest latent, if not patent, in the cherished companion of our devotional hours. The first four chapters give us an account in language "understood of the people," of the various editions through which à Kempis has passed—over six thousand in number—and of its original form; for the four books do not seem to have been originally combined in one volume; the third volume at first formed a separate work. The original name, too—*On Ecclesiastical Music*—though known to the learned, will puzzle many, until they learn that the music meant is spiritual. Mr. Fitzgerald passes lightly over the hotly disputed question of authorship, though he seems inclined in favour of the Gerson hypothesis.

The last four chapters discuss the contents of the book. Mr. Fitzgerald well says, "The most wonderful thing in this wonderful book is that we can find in it almost everything. It is as though the whole *curriculum* of piety were there. There are principles, maxims, methods, practices, and discipline. If we look for any special point, we are almost certain to find something on the topic." It is this quality in the *Imitation* which has made it so general a favourite, *The World's own Book*, as the title of the present edition styles it, "the book which the world has opened its arms to receive," according to the happy phrase of Dr. Johnson. Mr. Fitzgerald's comments are in illustration of this universal applicability of the *Imitation*, calling attention to the more striking, if the term is lawful where all is striking, maxims of life and conduct, spiritual, moral, and social, which it contains. On some points we cannot agree with Mr. Fitzgerald. We can see no sufficient foundation for his inference that in the Third Book we are to detect revelations of a personal character; an outbreak of indignation from the author's fellow-Religious in response to his plain speaking and unsparing reproofs of their conduct, and a consequent state of depression in himself which his reflections were to enable him to overcome. Surely the knowledge of the springs of life which so acute an observer had obtained will sufficiently explain all his wise maxims without having recourse to an hypothesis so condemnatory of the quiet atmosphere in which the writer apparently lived. Again, his commentator seems to have pushed the counsel of à Kempis further than the latter could

have intended when from such a passage as this: "Blessed is the simplicity which leaves the difficult path of questionings and goeth on to the plain and sure path of God's commandments," he gathers that he would condemn the "path of questionings" altogether. "Reverent questionings" into the mysteries of Revelation have their distinct place within the scheme of spiritual life, not indeed of all, but of those called to that work, and need not withdraw, as they did not, for instance, in St. Thomas Aquinas, from the plain and sure paths of God's commandments. What à Kempis condemns is the disposition which allows itself to be absorbed in the questionings so as to forget the superior necessity of persevering in the plain paths. However, even if we disagree with Mr. Fitzgerald on a point or two like these, we can recognize the studious reading which has led to such trains of thought, and we can candidly recommend his little book, which Mr. Elliot Stock has brought out in a very dainty fashion.

---

#### 7.—VOICES OF THE PAST.<sup>1</sup>

Aloug with the New Humour, the New Journalism, and the New Woman, we have also the New Poetry and the New Drama. Whitman and Ibsen having enchanted or bewildered us in other fields, the realm of sacred poetry must expect its turn, and the little work before us sufficiently proves that it will not have long to wait.

The author tells us in his Preface, that he admires, with a sort of longing envy, the "far off days when, sweet in its first blossom, religious life developed beautifully in the cloister." But those days are gone: religious life became corrupt, and was rightly extirpated; "for what so hideous as a festering lily?" "Not even St. Benedict could now resuscitate it."<sup>2</sup>

He wishes, however, to erect its monument. "I have tried to imagine how those men and women of old lived and died in peace and happiness; and have supposed that love of Nature, and also real or fancied visions of the unseen, came sometimes to break the monotony of their life."

<sup>1</sup> *Voices of the Past*. A Sacred Drama, in Three Parts. London: Skeffington and Son, 1894. viii. 128 pp.

<sup>2</sup> We are, however, told, in a note, that "in mourning over the past, we must not forget our debt of gratitude to the numerous Sisterhoods, and other benevolent agencies; that now take the place of the ancient monastic Orders."

To a Catholic, more especially to one who has any experience of the festering lily, which still contrives to grow and propagate so vigorously, the result of this attempt must be infinitely sad, affording as it does one more evidence of the great gulf fixed between us and those, who with no desire to be unfriendly, are as complete strangers to our life and modes of thought as if they dwelt in the moon. The sketch presented to us of religious life, in its ideal days, exhibits the most utter misconception of its first fundamental principles, the inmates of the cloister apparently sustaining their souls on sentiment, and delicious melancholy, and being ever ready for a good cry. The model monk, who is named Virgil, is as tearful as the pious Æneas. One of his comrades asks him, "Do you never meet with Melancholy?" He replies,

O yes : what music in the sorrow of her voice !  
 She often comes to me at that enchanting hour  
 When moonlight, dreamlight, dawnlight, meet, and blend,  
 And thrills my soul with her mysterious charm.

The piece will prove interesting to old-fashioned readers, chiefly on account of the novelties exhibited in its methods and structure. The *dramatis personæ* consist of a brotherhood and sisterhood, who apparently dwell side by side and in constant intercourse, interchanging presents of flowers and sentiments. The brotherhood, which includes a Horace as well as a Virgil, numbers in its ranks a fallen angel, who is, however, not so utterly fallen as to be beyond repentance, and this he is, in a vague and dreamy manner, working out. The most extraordinary incidents occur, with most prosaic accompaniments, till at length, in some manner not easily intelligible, the angel accomplishes his object and mounts upwards.

But it is the *technique* that is most remarkable. Some of the criticisms of the press quoted at the end are very laudatory on this score, one Review declaring that "some of the passages are very beautiful, and linger in the mind with a sweet insistence," while another says, "It has a form approaching that of the poetic drama, and is written in irregular blank verse." It may be worth while to give a few examples of this form of composition.

The verse is certainly "irregular," so much so indeed as to make it hard to say whether the mysterious inmate, above described, is to be called "Angēlo Salvātus," or "Angēlo Salvātus." On the one hand may be quoted such lines as

and,  
Be merciful, give Angelo release !  
"O come, Salvatus, come," the angels cry.  
On the other,

And when they bore Angelo to the grave,  
They all did chaunt the Requiem's sad stave ;  
When lo ! sweet cries of rapture came from Heaven  
For Salvatus restored to them forgiven.

These lines are, however, more rhythmical than many which we meet, and it is often very hard to understand what difference there may be between irregular blank verse, and the most colloquial prose cut up into lengths.

Thus, one of the most remarkable episodes in the drama, is a miraculous supply of food brought by angels to the refectory when the brethren were like to have gone supperless to bed. The Prior thus improves the occasion :

However extraordinary this incident  
May appear, it must remain so for the present.  
Speak not of it outside, or at the Gate ;  
Lest it should make men sin by scoffing.  
But were we to believe nothing, except  
What we could perfectly comprehend ; not only  
Our stock of knowledge in all branches of learning,  
Would be shrunk to nothing ; but even  
Affairs of common life could not be carried on.

The community then proceed to partake of the miraculous provisions, holding (after the manner of monks) a conversation in such style as this—

HORACE (*eating*) What bread ! I never tasted finer.  
These grapes are exquisite (*helping himself to a cluster of purple grapes.*)  
(*Drinks*) And matchless wine !  
It refreshes, and takes all thirst away ;  
And renovates, without heating the blood.

The *finale* is also worthy of quotation. (Angelo Salvatus has just been borne off.)

And when they saw mid that seraphic harmony,  
The GOD who tuned this music to their souls ;  
Hold out His hand in highest majesty,  
To welcome home His Angelo-Salvatus  
And give to him the holy wreath of palm ;  
A shout tremendous, shook all Heav'n :  
The Brothers answered by enthusiastic cheers,  
Which rang thro' valleys, hills, and woods, and rent the air.

8.—BLESSED EDMUND CAMPION.<sup>1</sup>

The main points in the life of Edmund Campion, from his Oxford days down to his end at Tyburn, are set forth in this little book with much sympathy and with great pithiness of expression. The brilliant public orator of the University, the eloquent Jesuit and missionary, and the noble martyr, are the chief capacities in which this illustrious man is known to us, and he seems to have been pre-eminent in each. The zeal with which he worked for the Church during his brief stay in England and the resignation which characterized his last moments of martyrdom stand out boldly amid sordid surroundings, where religion in a new dress was flaunted before the eyes of the people, and had her tenets enforced, not by argument or by reason, but by the armed hand of the law. Elizabeth is responsible for many martyrs, and perhaps the greatest of all is the subject of this book. His conversion to Catholicism, his determination to do his best to restore the ancient Faith to his country, or at least prevent the spread of heresy, his capture and execution—these are all matters for study. The state of England under Elizabeth appears appalling to modern readers. Many instructive side-lights are thrown on this subject by Mr. Willington, and form a fitting framework for his main theme. The story of Father Edmund Campion is, however, now too well known to need further comment. His beatification under Leo XIII., three centuries after he had been hanged, drawn, and quartered on Tyburn Hill, restored him to the knowledge and veneration of Catholics, and of English Catholics especially.

9.—PANTA RYE: A PRELUDE.<sup>2</sup>

This volume contains some four hundred closely printed octavo pages, and is intended, we suppose, to be a work of fiction. We can only look upon the book as the outcome of considerable presumption; for "Eremus and Another" (whoever they may be) are nothing but the very charlatans of romance. The novel, according to Goethe, ought to unfold itself by

<sup>1</sup> *An English Manor House in the Days of Queen Elizabeth; or, The Story of Edmund Campion, S.J.* By J. R. Willington, M.A. London: Art and Book Company, 1895.

<sup>2</sup> *Panta Rye: A Prelude.* By Eremus and Another. London: Swan, Sonnenschein, 1894.



sentiments and events, and of sentiments and events, it is true, the pages of *Panta Rye* are packed full. But they are all of the most trite and tedious character, and lead nowhither. There is absolutely no plot, no main motive to which the minor incidents are subordinate and lead up. It is indeed painful to read on through twenty-four chapters in the hope of discovering a story—were it even the most oft-told—and in the end to get neither enlightenment nor amusement for one's trouble. How this most eccentric medley ever came to be compiled, and how it came ever to be published in the expectation of its being read, we cannot imagine. It has neither savour nor salt, rhyme nor reason. It is a stringing together of the most inconsequent inanities, and a wanton misuse of paper and printer's ink.

As has been said, there is no story. So far so good. Many writers who were wholly ignorant of the requirements of fiction have given us agreeable and amusing moments under the pretence of giving us a novel. But "Eremus and Another" have not done so. They have had the exceeding conceit to fill page upon page with childish, useless twaddle, and that is all. As for characterization, there is none either. They have dressed up puppets of the most deformed type in the most motley garments, and have then betrayed an utter inability to manage them. No *guignol* was ever more ludicrous. All the characters from the hero—we suppose we shall have to call him so—to the "garden warblers," which received crumbs and "a sweetly sad look" from one of the female personages, have existed nowhere except in the imaginative brains of our authors.

Looking upon the book as an æsthetic product, we find it equally faulty. There is no attention to order in time, order in place, symmetry, or definiteness. It contains an appalling amount of quotation, not a little misquotation, and a quantity of offensive pedantry. Every second sentence is a futile effort to be funny. Then, again, it has no literary merit. There is a great deal of vulgar English, school-book phraseology, and loose grammar. We thought at first that it was the intention of the authors to make some of their characters playfully pedantic, but we found on further perusal that the authors talked quite as foolishly and pedantically as their characters, when the latter were silent. A word may be said about the priest whom it has been thought fit to introduce solely for the purpose of having his "arguments" "refuted." We are afraid that "Eremus and Another," have as invincible an ignorance of

the character of a priest, as they have of theology. Their "Monsignor Standish" is the usual cold, calculating individual as seen through Protestant glasses. He might well have been omitted. His presence only shows our authors' audacious desire to tackle all subjects from the "back-hair of young girls," to "the celibacy of the clergy." If we were to say much more about *Panta Rye*, it might seem that we were attaching undue importance to the volume—if we have not already done so. In conclusion, let us trust that "Eremus and Another" will not attempt another novel until they have mastered a pure and simple manner of composition. Their knowledge of books may be wide though scrappy; for they quote many authors, from Virgil to Bret Harte; but we think, on the whole, that many of the pages of this book are terrible examples of the danger of a little knowledge. Their present style is a jumble of opposites, one paragraph being like the prattle of a child, another like the perplexity of a George Meredith. In the next place they might find a story to tell, when they have acquired the power to tell one clearly. Otherwise we have no hope of their ever being able to produce any creditable or comprehensible work.

---

### *Literary Record.*

---

#### I.—BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

*The Price of the Pearl*<sup>1</sup> is a sixpenny volume containing four short stories, three on English Catholic life during the days of the persecution, and one of which the scene is laid in Italy, but the theme is the conversion of a young American girl and her Scotch governess. These stories are tastefully and instructively told by the Baroness Pauline von Hügel.

Dean Farrar has a weakness, really surprising in a man of his undoubted attainments, for making statements adverse to the Catholic Church or other institutions which displease him, apparently without taking the slightest pains to acquaint himself with the facts. Thus, preaching last Good Friday,<sup>2</sup> he assured

<sup>1</sup> *The Price of the Pearl.* By Baroness Pauline von Hügel. London: Catholic Truth Society.

<sup>2</sup> Historical Series. No. XIX. *Dean Farrar on the Observance of Good Friday.* By the Rev. H. Thurston, S.J. XX. *Savonarola and the Reformation.* By the Very Rev. John Procter, O.P. London: Catholic Truth Society.

his hearers "it was not suggested by Scripture or by the practice of the early Church that we should spend the day in morbid, unnatural, and useless attempts to reproduce in imagination the physical agonies of our Lord upon the Cross," and a few days later, selecting Savonarola as his subject, he styled him a "harbinger" of the Reformation, as one who never "dwelt on" the "errors of Rome," who "denounced the worship of the Virgin," and "who would have none of the Church's superb ritual, its gorgeous, glittering, sensuous, and perfumed services." We need not, however, be too irate with the new Dean, since he has been the occasion of our possessing two such tracts as Father Thurston's on Good Friday Observance, and Father Procter's in defence of his brother Dominican. Each has without difficulty perfectly demolished the Dean, but each has done us a greater service than that, Father Thurston by his interesting account of the mode in which Good Friday was kept in this century, Father Procter by setting so vividly before us the real Savonarola. If any one were to claim Savonarola as a harbinger of the true Reformation, the reformation of morals through which the Church passed in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, the claim could be readily allowed. As for his relation to the false Reformation, the revolt against Catholic doctrine and authority, one can only regret that he did not live half a century later to try issues with Luther and his fellows.

*Sacrifices of Masses* is, as its name indicates, an examination into the Anglican plea that Article xxxi., since it speaks of "sacrifices of Masses" not the "Sacrifice of the Mass," had in view and condemned not the Catholic doctrine of the Mass, but a popular abuse that had sprung up. The author understands his subject, and argues it convincingly.

Now that the Servite Fathers are in London, we naturally hear a good deal about their Seven Founders,<sup>1</sup> and many of us would like to know something of their lives. An author who knows how to write with effect tells the interesting story of the seven youths, members of a Confraternity of our Lady, who received each the call from their heavenly Patroness to leave the world and retire together into the solitude of Monte Senario. The Catholic Truth Society also supplies two tiny devotional tracts, one an *Hour with my Crucifix*, the other *A Month's Reading*. The last mentioned gives a short reading for each of the thirty-one days, the readings being extracts from Holy Scripture

<sup>1</sup> *The Seven Founders of the Servite Order*. London: Catholic Truth Society.

and devotional writers, and always containing some striking thought.

Mrs. Pittar's *Protestant converted by her Bible and Prayer Book*<sup>1</sup> is a little book which first appeared in 1847, and has since done much good work, as is testified by the many editions, English and foreign, through which it has passed. Before her death, the authoress, hoping that it might still be of use, made provision for this reprint. The book is partly narrative and partly doctrinal. The doctrinal part is, it must be confessed, somewhat heavy, and will perhaps suffer some skipping at the reader's hands. But the narrative part is brightly written, and will be found of interest. Very amusing sometimes are her experiences with the Protestant ministers she consulted on her difficulties. One interesting experience is sure to arrest the reader's attention. Nearly the earliest shock to her Protestantism Mrs. Pittar received from a sermon by Bishop Gillis at Edinburgh. This prelate is remembered in Scotland for his controversial sermons, and here we have one full of forcible argument and quaint humour.

For a time the Bishop of Manchester, Dr. Moorhouse, seemed to be having it all his own way, in his *rechauffée* of Mr. Puller's *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*. But the nemesis has come at last, not the less severely because delayed for a while. We know that the Bishop of Salford first took up the cudgels, but what we have now on our table for notice are the five lectures delivered by Father Bernard Vaughan in the Free Trade Hall.<sup>2</sup> Father Vaughan had set himself a difficult task in undertaking so far to popularize the arguments of an intricate historical controversy as to enable his vast audiences to judge intelligently of their value. However, he has succeeded in his task, as he has succeeded in so many others. One feels, as one reads, that the hard-headed Lancastrians might really be able to grasp the points and perceive how hopeless were Dr. Moorhouse's contentions. It will require a good many of the Queen's horses to set the Bishop of Manchester up again on his pedestal.

The *Illustrated Catalogue of the Paris Salon, 1895* (Chatto and Windus), is interesting as giving reproductions of sketches made by the artists themselves of the various pictures exhibited.

<sup>1</sup> *A Protestant converted by her Bible and Prayer Book*. London: Catholic Truth Society.

<sup>2</sup> *Lectures in reply to the Bishop of Manchester*. By Father Bernard Vaughan. Manchester: Heywood.

In looking through the list, we notice that while there is more which is positively objectionable than in our own Academy, there is far less which is puerile and trivial, and although the best work done here need not fear comparison with that of France, there is a more widespread attempt on the part of French artists to strive after lofty ideals. But what will most forcibly strike the majority of readers is the rendering of the titles of pictures, for the benefit of readers on this side of the Channel, in the style of "English as she is spoke," though these specimens can hardly claim, like that immortal work, to be "clean of Gallicisms." Thus we have, "The relays of the Risle," for *Des relais* (swamps) *de la Risle*; "The feed" (*La becquée*)—"The famished ones" (a brood of ducklings); "David, shepherd;" "Open-air musical instruments" (*Musique champêtre*); "The reparier of antiquities;" "A centenary in Provence" (the "centenary" being an old oak-tree); "Hunting with falcons;" "The leap of the dam water" (shooting the lasher); "Mounsebank" (*une foraine*); "Time for the soup at the door of a barracks;" and perhaps most remarkable of all, the portrait of a lady in the character of "Miss Quickly."

*The Ignatian Album*<sup>1</sup> is a little book of reminiscences of St. Ignatius at Manresa and Barcelona, containing pictures of the scenes of his more remarkable experiences, with explanatory notes. It is drawn up by Father Francis Daly, S.J.

Another translation of the *Imitation*<sup>2</sup> might seem to be a superfluity. Nevertheless, that before us has a distinct character of its own, which not improbably will be its recommendation in the eyes of some. It appears, as a rule, to aim less than others with which we are acquainted at being verbally literal, and to endeavour rather to present in the most forcible manner what the translator believes to be the true meaning of the original. We may instance a well-known passage from the Second Book (c. v.), which we quote first from the version now probably most familiar, and secondly from that under review.

(1)

We must not trust too much to ourselves: for grace and understanding are often wanting to us.

There is in us but little light, and this we soon lose by negligence.

Oftentimes we are quite unconscious how interiorly blind we are.

We often do amiss and do worse in excusing ourselves.

<sup>1</sup> *The Ignatian Album*. Limerick: Guy and Co.

<sup>2</sup> *The Imitation of Christ*. A new Translation. Dublin: Charles Eason, 1895.

(2)

We have no reason for trusting much in ourselves, when so often grace and understanding fail us.

The light we have is scant at best, and even this we very often lose by carelessness. Often, too, we do not notice how blind we are within. Frequently we do wrong, and do worse in excusing ourselves.

Here, we think, the new version quite holds its own, and we consider the principle of translation above indicated to be the right one, if it can be well carried out. We also notice that something like the almost rhythmical structure of the Latin original is not unsuccessfully reproduced. One thing we must regret: the translator consistently renders the second person singular by "you" instead of "thou." This we take to be a mistake, and much force is undoubtedly lost. Take, for example, the following (iii. 13):

Break out into anger with yourself, and allow no pride to remain in you, but show yourself so meek and lowly that all may trample upon you and tread you down like mud in the streets. What have you to complain of, worthless creature? What can you say against those that insult you, wretched sinner that you are, when you have so often sinned against God, and so many times deserved Hell?

We have received the Second Edition of the Dean of Maynooth's *Ceremonies of some Ecclesiastical Functions*.<sup>1</sup> A work on such a subject appearing with such authority sufficiently recommends itself.

Masses for complete choirs we have in abundance, but of Masses for three voices<sup>2</sup> we have not too many. Dr. Joseph Smith has composed one such for three female voices, which he hopes may be found useful in convent chapels. It is, as it should be, melodious but grave, and puts no strain on the voices. The accompaniment is scholarly and not too overpowering. Dr. Smith also sends some Litanies.

<sup>1</sup> *The Ceremonies of some Ecclesiastical Functions*. By the Rev. Daniel O'Loan, Dean of Maynooth. Dublin: Browne and Nolan. 335 pp. 6s.

<sup>2</sup> *Mass for Three Female Voices*. By Joseph Smith, Mus.D. Dublin: Pohlmann, 1895.



## II.—MAGAZINES.

The Catholic Truth Society has for some time been dreaming of a periodical of its own, and the dream has now become a reality. The first number of the *Catholic Magazine*<sup>1</sup> appeared on May 1st, and if the future numbers sustain the standard which this has set for them, the magazine should become a general favourite. When all is so good one does not exactly know what to single out for special praise, but we may name Father Bridgett's "New Lights on Blessed Thomas More," Mr. Kegan Paul's "A Sussex Cloister," an account of Carthusian life at Parkminster, and "Queen O'Toole," a charming little cameo over the well-known signature "M. E. Francis." There is also an article by Mgr. Ward on St. Edmund's College, the first of a series of articles on "Our Catholic Colleges." It must be added that there is a serial story, that there are illustrations, and that the price is sixpence. The magazine may be specially recommended to families and schools, which will find in it plain, healthy, interesting, and instructive reading, attractive to young people, but not only to young people. We wish it all success.

Articles in recent numbers :

The CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA. (May 4, 1895.)

The Pope's Letter to the English. The Pope's Claims to Restitution and Italian Liberalism. The Hittite-Pelagians in the Islands of the Ægean Sea. The Actions and Instincts of Animals. Ricordo Materno (a Tale). Reviews. Bibliography. Chronicle.

—— (May 18, 1895.)

Science Laicized and its Inventory. The Spiritual Power of the Pope and its new Assailants. The Propriety of the *Non Expedit* in connection with Italian Ballot-Boxes. Nicholas III. Ricordo Materno (a Tale). Reviews. Archæology. Chronicle.

The ÉTUDES RELIGIEUSES. (May 15, 1895.)

Science at the Banquet Table. *Father H. Martin*. The Grandson of the great Condé. *Father H. Chérot*. The Centenary of the Floral Games. *Father E. Cornut*. The Expedition to Madagascar. *Father E. Brampain*. On China. *Father L. Gaillard*. The Religious and the New Taxation. *Father R. de Scoraille*. Bulletin of Social Science. *Father P. Fristot*. Miscellanies and Reviews. Chronicle.

<sup>1</sup> The *Catholic Magazine*. No. 1. May, 1895. London : Catholic Truth Society.



## The REVUE GÉNÉRALE. (May, 1895.)

Ketteler and Manning. *Charles Woeste*. Going into Exile. *Charles Buet*. Aunt Ursula. *M. Besancenet*. The Romance of Iron. *H. Ponthière*. At the Tomb of Napoleon III. *Alfred de Rider*. The Diary of a Paris Priest. *Ch. de Ricault d'Héricault*. Our Paris Letter. *Edouard Trogan*. Varieties. Bibliography.

## L'UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE. (May 15, 1895.)

The Pope's Letter to the English. The Aureolas of Joan of Arc. *R. P. Belon*. The Roman Catacombs. *J. M. Bourchamy*. The Priest in Contemporary Literature. *Abbé Delfour*. The Origins of the French Churches and Episcopal Calendars. *C. F. Bellet*. Popes and Bankers in the Sixteenth Century. *F. Vernet*. Biblical Works. *E. Jacquier*. Miscellanies. Bibliography. Chronicle.

## REVUE BÉNÉDICTINE. (May, 1895.)

Miscellaneous Jottings on Christian Antiquity. *Dom. G. Morin*. The Reform of Melk in the Fifteenth Century. *Dom. U. Berlière*. Recent Contributions to Benedictine History. *Dom. U. Berlière*. Autumn at Beuron. *Dom. L. Janssens*. Obituary. Notes and Reviews.

## PRÉCIS HISTORIQUES. (May, 1895.)

Catholic Missions in the Belgian Congo. Belgian Mission of Bengal. Mission of Kwango. The Son of the Grand Condé. *H. Chérot*. Obituary.

## DER KATHOLIK. (May, 1895.)

The Science of Insurance. *Dr. Ph. Huppert*. Caspar von Gennep. *N. Paulus*. John Bugenhagen and the Spread of Protestantism in Pomerania. *E. Goerigk*. Dean Church. *Dr. Bellesheim*. Reviews, amongst which we remark a very favourable notice of Miss Allies' *History of the Church in England*. Part ii.

## STUDIEN UND MITTHEILUNGEN. (1895. I.)

The Origin and Earliest Form of the Breviary. *Dom B. Plaine*. Charity among the Cistercians. *L. Dolberg*. The Monastery of Brevnov and the Spread of Civilization. *L. Wintera*. The Antecedents of the Synod of Salzburg in 1456. *Dr. O. Grillnberger*. Cistercian Monasteries in Austria. *G. Lanz*. Annals of the Swabian Monastery of Hirsau. *O. Hafner*. Materials for the History of the Scotch Abbey of St. James' at Ratisbonne. *A. Renz*. The German Abbeys and the *Libri Obligationum et Solutionum* in the Vatican Archives, from 1295 to 1378. *Konrad Eubel*. Reviews and Notes.

